

THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

DECEMBER, 1847.

ART. I.—*Tesoro de Novelistas Espanoles, antiguos y modernos con una introducion y noticias.* De DON EUGENIO DE OCHOA. Baudry, Paris: 1847.

Treasury of Spanish Novelists, Ancient and Modern, with an Introduction and Notes. By DON EUGENIO DE OCHOA.

MORE than thirty years have passed away since a book appeared in the English language which professed to give "a history of fiction," and to that work it was justly objected at the time, that it "said nothing respecting the Spanish novelists."

The same objection may still be made, as far as English literature is concerned. We have no book giving us an account of the Spanish novelists; and we know not where to seek for any treatise that analyzes their productions, or makes known to us their respective merits. We are certainly indebted to Miss Thomasina Ross for an excellent translation of that portion of Bouterwek's "*Geschichte der Poesie und Beredsamkeit seit dem Ende der dreizehnten Jahrhunderts*," which may be regarded as a "History of Spanish literature;" but even in that history nothing can well be more meagre and unsatisfactory than the account of the Spanish novelists. Thus, for instance, Miss Ross's translation of Bouterwek, as published in "Bogue's European Library," comprises 450 closely printed pages; and of these there are not five pages devoted to the Spanish novelists. In fact, no novelist is specifically noticed by Bouterwek who was not a poet, with the ex-

ception of a few referred to under the heading of "Novels in the age of Cervantes and Lope de Vega."^{*}

Little is heard—scarcely anything known, of the prose compositions of Spanish authors, with the exception, perhaps, of the "Don Quixote" of Cervantes, the "History" of Mariana, the "Mexico" of De Solis, the "Lazarillo de Tormes" of Mendoza, and the "Guzman de Alfarache" of Aleman; and yet Spain abounds in noble prose compositions, many of them being compositions which, if our literature were in a healthy state, would long since have been translated, for they only require to be known to become popular.

At present, however, we have to deal but with the Spanish novelists. With the exceptions we have stated, nothing, or next to nothing, is known of them; although the poetry, the romances, and especially the chivalric lore of Spain, have obtained a world-wide circulation from the labours and researches of Southey, Lockhart, and many others. Calderon, Garcilaso, Lope de Vega, are thought of, though they may not be read, whilst 'The Cid' is embodied as a distinct image upon the minds of all who love to ponder over the lays of former times, and to fix their thoughts upon manners, customs, and men such as never can be restored, and never live nor move again in this world. It is but natural that those who love "The Cid," and delight in traditionary lore, should peruse with pleasure the "Volks-märchen" which almost monthly issue from the German press; but how comes it, that those who peruse with satisfaction the modern German novels, which are five-sixths rhapsody and one-sixth incident, and modern French

* See Bouterwek's History of Spanish Literature, translated by Miss T. Ross. Bogue's European Library, pp. 320-323. In page 322, this note is added:

"Those who wish to find a catalogue of Spanish novels and romances of middling and inferior merit, must turn to Blankenburg, who in his Appendix to Solzer's article *Erzählung*, enumerates them at considerable length. The list might be augmented by an examination of the collection of novels and romances in the library of the University of Göttingen."

A sketch of the various classes of Spanish novelists and romance writers, will be found in the *Foreign Quarterly Review*, Vol. ii. pp. 486-511. It is interesting as a composition in English by a Spaniard—Don Telesforo de Trueba.

novels, which are seven-tenths incident and three-tenths obscenity and infidelity, should never seek for (in the original, nor be catered for by translations) the charms that may be discovered in the Spanish novelists?

In what does the taste for the French and German novel, and the apathy as to the Spanish originate? Are they to be deemed attributable to a refined taste, or a debauched taste? Is the novel-reading taste now-a-days like the theatrical taste as it is exhibited in London,—where “*The Marriage of Figaro*,” or “*Jack Sheppard*,” or “*Jim Crow*,” or “*Ethiopian Singers*,” occupy the patent and large theatres, and attract crowded houses; whilst “*Hamlet*” is acted at a tiny play-house in Oxford Street, and “*King Lear*” is banished to the distant and vulgar district of Sadler’s Wells?

There is not in the Spanish novels, as in the German, any fine theory for the abandonment, the neglect, or the violation of the marriage-contract. The adulterer in thought is not sanctified, nor the ruffian suicide deified. There is not in any one of the Spanish novels anything like a *Praslin* murder, in all its butcherly details, depicted for the gratification, the excitement, the satisfaction, and the imitation of the reader, as may be found in so many of the modern French novels. Impurity is neither advocated, praised nor portrayed. The worst and most degrading passions of our nature are not gloated over with fiend-like pleasure and malignity. There are few passages in them that a maiden may not read without a blush, and a man with perfect safety. Their pages are not like to those of the French and German novelists,—the portals to sin, and which none can pass through without contamination. As a body of writers, it may be affirmed of the Spanish novelists, that they have guided themselves by the maxim of *Cervantes*, viz.—that the mind must be as carefully guarded from impure thoughts, as the sight from indecent pictures—“*pues de las cosas obscenas y torpes los pensamientos se han de apartar, quanto mas los ojos.*”

In this respect, at least, the worst enemies to the Church of Spain must admit that it did good service to the light literature of Spain. The fact is too glaring to be controverted, and too notorious to be denied; and we accordingly find it unwillingly and grudgingly acknowledged by one of those organs of public opinion in this country which

never yet have shown themselves disposed to do justice to the Roman Catholic and Apostolic Church.

"Before a Spanish author," it is observed by the *Quarterly Review*, "could see the light, he was forced to pass through the tremendous defile of bishops and inquisitors, lords of the council, secretaries of state, and notaries royal and apostolical, whose licenses and approbations generally fill half-a-sheet at the beginning of each volume. *This wretched system* produced one solitary benefit to compensate for its manifold evils: it completely checked the corruption which disgraces the French and Italians. *The Spaniards may boast that their language has never been profaned by becoming the vehicle of impurity.*"*

With this testimony in favour of the Spanish novelists, we repeat the question,—Why are not their compositions

* *Quarterly Review*, Vol. xiii. p. 403. That the censorship was honestly exercised by the Church in Spain, is proved by a reluctant and adverse witness, who in referring to the novel of Lazarillo de Tormes, has the following remarks:

"The skill with which Mendoza has sketched the vices of avarice and selfishness in the persons into whose service Lazarillo enters, is no less remarkable than the bold regard for truth, which led him to include priests in the number of his odious characters. The Inquisition, of course, could not expect that the Spaniards should regard the ecclesiastic profession as a security against every vice, and Lazarillo de Tormes sufficiently proves that in Mendoza's time *the priesthood was not guaranteed against public satire in Spain.*" Bouterwek, as translated by Miss T. Ross, p. 143. Bogue's Edition. With this testimony as to the manner in which the censorship was exercised, assuredly more gentle language might be employed with respect to it by an English writer, who could not but be aware that there were such things in England, at one time, as licenses to printers, that the errors of the press were severely punished, that in the reign of George I., and the year 1719, a printer's apprentice was convicted of high treason for the printing, without publishing, of a paper called "*Vox Populi*;" and finally, that the Reviewer himself was a member of the party which made Sir Vicary Gibbs, Attorney General—an individual who in the year 1810 had filed *ex-officio* informations against one half, or about one half, of the fifty newspapers then published in London; and that the same party, of which the *Quarterly Review* is and has been a consistent advocate, passed in the year 1819, *the Six Acts*. It might be worth the while of some friend to freedom of opinion, to contrast "the liberty of the press" and "the libel law" in England, with "the purity of the press" and the exercise of "the censorship" in Spain.

popular in this country? or, rather, why is it that, so far from being popular, the great majority of them remain absolutely unknown; whilst that book which may be regarded as the noblest specimen of its class—"Don Quixote"—is to be found in every library, and copies of it to be seen on every cheap book-stall? We greatly fear that the answer to this enquiry must be,—that the purity of the Spanish novelists has rendered them not popular in England; or that purity being known, an acquaintance with the fact has had the effect of impressing those who have a pecuniary interest in providing for the public taste, with the conviction, that wit however fine, and humour however rich, unless they were made palatable by lubricity, could never find a profitable sale in a country which has been overspread with heresy. This we know as an historical fact, that, wherever we can find the attempt made to render the Catholic religion odious, its priests contemptible, its kindly monks and its charitable nuns objects of detestation, we shall be able to discover that their slanderers and base assailants—no matter what their profession, their position, or their condition—have always sought to make their satirical stories acceptable by pandering to the passions, and inciting, by the language they used, their readers to violate the precepts of chastity. A Rabelais, a Boccaccio, "auctor purissimæ impuritatis," a Mapes, a Voltaire, a Margaret of Navarre,* all devoting themselves to the same object, have employed the same means, and their popularity has been in proportion to their nastiness.

As long as heresy was strong in this empire—as long as it was buttressed up by penal laws and ex-officio informations, the effort to contend against it and its strongest ally, impurity, might have been a vain one. Heresy, however, is now shaken to its very base; and we perhaps may afford some aid in facilitating its downfall, when we call the attention of the publishing and the reading world to a mine of innocent amusement, of pure literary recreation,

* Margaret, Queen of Navarre, was the patroness of Rabelais, Marot, Dolet, Des Perriers, and other reforming assailants of the monks. Of her work, the "Heptameron," it is said by a Protestant authority, *the Athenæum*, that "it contains passages and anecdotes which would not now be tolerated even in the most depraved society."—No. 1000. p. 1318.

by which the mind may be refreshed, whilst the heart is preserved from corruption.

The publication of the present collection of Spanish novelists, for which we are indebted to the spirit and enterprise of M. Baudry, affords us the opportunity of doing this; and the mode in which we mean to seek to make this class of writers popular, will, we trust, be found that which is the most agreeable to our readers. Our arguments to show that the Spanish novelists are worthy of being read, shall be what we regard as the best of all arguments,—facts; and these facts shall consist of extracts, which (as far as an indifferent translation can effect the object) may make the writers themselves best known to the public.

Let us suppose the reader to agree in opinion with us; and we then ask, what happier introduction can there be to a narration of strange adventures than the following,—where the sole auditor is a clergyman,—the reciter, and the hero of his own “eventful history,” a lay-brother,—and the scene a field surrounded with rocks, such as we may suppose attached to a monastery located in one of the sierras of Spain, and reminding us, as we read, of the description of the hermitage of St. Anthony, that belongs to Our Lady of Montserrat?*

“*The Vicar.* Previous to my arrival at this holy monastery, I heard a great deal, brother Alonzo, of your excellent disposition, of the troubles that you had passed through when you were in the world, with the various masters by whom you had been employed; of the good and faithful service you had rendered to them, and the bad return and worse payment you received from them. As this then, brother Alonzo, happens to be one of the evenings in which the monks are permitted to take some rest and recreation in this field, I shall regard it as an act of great charity on your part, if you will give me a particular account of your life, so minute and so particular, that no one circumstance may be omitted. All I can offer in return for this favour, is a great attention to every word you may choose to speak, and a very great pleasure in listening to you.

“*Alonzo.* It is quite true this is one of the few days on which,

* El sitio de la Hermita de San Antonio Abad es muy hermoso, y acomodado para la quietud; pues puesto en ella parece que está uno en otra region muy distante, y exempta de todo el bullicio del mundo.—*Compendio Historial del Portentoso Santuario de Nuestra Senora de Monserrate*, p. 67.

according to ancient practice, the monks are permitted to enjoy a slight relaxation, and which serves as a sort of rest from the long and continuous labour to which they are subjected in this monastery. Happily it is a day in which the verdure of the fields invites us to repose; and as you, good father, are pleased to permit an humble lay-brother like myself to speak freely to you; and as I have no fear of the over-scrupulous or too timorous members of our community listening to our conversation, I shall recount to you the various events of my busy life, telling you who were my parents, what my country, and why it is that I have at last come to this holy monastery, the habit of whose monks is more precious and more worthy of respect and admiration in my eyes, than the finest robes and the richest brocades of all the kings and princes in the world. We are completely alone in this desert place: there is no one to listen to us. Let then these thick and branching trees serve to shade us from the strong and ardent rays of the life-giving luminary; and in order that we may have the more rest, refreshment, and satisfaction in our siesta, let us place ourselves close to those bright waters which come tumbling and foaming down from the lofty proud looking mountains with which we are surrounded. And now having so arranged ourselves for a conversation, I have, reverend father, to pray your patience; as you have commanded me to speak, I have to entreat you to listen. Lay-brothers do not talk, but I am to become a talking lay-brother. Be it so, but I give God thanks that what I have to say is uttered in what I may regard as a perfect solitude; that there is no one, I may be certain, to listen to me: and as ears do not hear, so there shall be no tongues to recount my errors, nor to recapitulate my faults.

"In the first place then, you must know, my good father, I was born in Andalusia," &c. &c.—*Rivera. El Donado Hablador*, cap. 1.

Simple and even insignificant as this extract may appear, it is, we think, impossible to read it, without feeling that it is animated with a spirit of Catholicity, however unpretending may be its development, or however slightly perceptible its manifestation. It is this substratum of Catholicity that may be said to be utterly wanting in English literature. It is *the defect* for which no genius, no talent, and no intellectual gift nor grace can make compensation. The literature of England is rich in all things but one,—Catholic literature; but beyond all other things, it is defective in a light Catholic literature; and it may, with perfect truth be affirmed, that until the last ten years no attempt was made to supply this great deficiency. Never, until now, had we novelists to bring all the riches

of imagination, all the charms of fancy, and all the tenderness, delicacy, and tact of feminine feeling to the aid of religion—to circulate and popularize sound Catholic morals, whilst captivating the hearts and entrancing the thoughts of their readers. We want a light Catholic literature in every department, more of Mr. Burns's gold and glittering toy-books, more of Mr. Richardson's cheap children's books; we require for the infantile reasoners and nascent thinkers, more of such tales as the Rev. Dr. Russell has given them, in translating those of the Canon Schmidt. We want, in English, novels written in the spirit of Lady Georgiana Fullerton, though we must despair of ever having many written with such power, such truthfulness, such grace, and such felicity of language. We ought to have, *we must have*, a cheap, light, amusing Catholic literature, and if we cannot supply the want by a home-made article, let us at least seek for it abroad; and our authors, and our publishers, may feel assured of this, that if such be sought for, a more abundant supply will be found in the literature of Spain, than in that of any other country in Europe. Had this fact been known before, or had it been attended to, we might now be reaping the advantage of it.

It is probable that, at the very time this article is published, London will be inundated with what are called "Christmas books," and which, if they resemble many of their predecessors, will give us tales of seduction, or *diablerie*, or of rich men's feasts, or bad men's heartlessness; whilst the mighty mystery of christianity will be as little thought of, as little spoken of, as little referred to, as if it were the obsolete myth of some exploded paganism; and yet, in place of these, there might be published a Christmas book, such as never yet has appeared in the English language—the loveliest pastoral that ever yet was penned—an offering so sweet, that it is not unworthy of being placed on the altar of the Blessed Virgin, in whose honour, and to whose praise it was originally composed. We allude to Lope de Vega's "Pastores de Belen." This charming combination of rich prose and faultless verse, this christian tale, with Church-like hymns upon the Nativity of Our Lord, requiring in its translator the gifts of a first-rate poet, lies neglected in our libraries; whilst things are published which are called "*Christmas books*," that seem best

suitd for circulation during the licentiousness of the Saturnalia.*

* Two brief extracts from the poetry of the "Pastores de Belen," will show how well suited it is to be circulated as a Christmas book.

"Nacio la vida, que la dio a la muerte,
Y trocose la muerte en dulce vida,
Vistio la luz de nueva gloria el cielo,
Y la oliva de paz nacio en la tierra,
Huvo amistades entre Dios, y el hombre
En las puras entranas de una Virgen.

"Aquella hermosa Madre, y siempre Virgen
Estando condenado a eterna muerte
Truxo la vida, y libertad al hombre,
Que desta Virgen procedio la vida,
Con que salio de la prision la tierra,
Y vio las puertas del sereno cielo."

* * * * *

Pastores de Belen, Lib. iv. p. 239.

"La aldeana graciosa
Recien parida
Visitandola Reyes
No les da silla.

"Una oscura noche
Del Sol embidia
Pario la aldeana
De nuestra villa.

"Fuimos sus parientes
A ver de dia
De riquezas pobres
Claros enigmas.

"Hallamosla sola,
Pero tan linda
Que baxava el Cielo
Todo a servilla.

"Mas aunque su Madro
Fue un tiempo rica
Ella estava pobre
Mas siempre limpia.

"No tuvo en la cama
Ricas cortinas

We stand in need of a light Catholic literature; we believe, that in this respect the public feeling is in advance of our *litterateurs* and our publishers, and that if the

El Cielo era Cielo
Que la cubria.

“La cuna fue pajas
Y las Mantillas
Lirios, acuzenas
Y clavellinas.

“Eran los cristales
Y zelosias
Pedazos de yelo
Por donde mira.

“Reyes del Oriente
Tambien caminan
Oro le presentan
Incienso, y mirra.

“Como no las tiene
La hermosa Nina
Visitandola Reyes
No les da silla.”

Ibid, pp. 240, 241. Valencia Edition, 1645.

This work is not specified by Bouterwek, but his observations upon the *Autos Sacramentales* of Lope de Vega and of Calderon, may serve to indicate to the Catholic, where much profitable and interesting reading can be found. That which Bouterwek denounces, we may be certain is deserving of respect if not of admiration. These are his words as regards Calderon:

“Calderon's *Autos Sacramentales*, may be noticed in a few words. In this class of dramatic composition, Calderon pursued the path previously trodden by Perez de Montalvan, but he left his model far behind him. Some of his autos, of which that entitled *La Devocion de la Cruz*, (the Miracles of the Cross, or literally, the Devotion of the Cross,) may be cited as an example, are the grandest and most ingenious productions of the kind in the Spanish language. But in these spiritual dramas, reason and moral feeling are so perverted by extravagant and fantastic notions of religious faith, that it is impossible to forbear congratulating those nations whose better fate has excluded them from amusements of this kind.”—Bouterwek—Miss T. Ross's translation, Bogue's Edition, p. 372.

We cannot refrain from giving a specimen of the style in which

people were supplied with such a literature, they would willingly and readily purchase it. But if we be mistaken in our belief, then we affirm, that it is absolutely necessary for England to have such a literature, if for no other purpose than to counteract and serve as an antidote to the beastly and poisonous light literature of France.

And here we may remark, how great a similarity there is between the French and Spanish novelists in their choice of subjects, and how widely different is their mode of treating them.

Sharers, swindlers, imposters, thieves, and their female associates, are depicted with equal gusto by the French and Spanish novelists. The former elevate those vagabonds and worst plagues of society, to the rank of heroes and heroines. The ruffian, or the robber, or the assassin, is invested by them with great and generous qualities or marvellous accomplishments; he cuts and stabs his victim as if he were performing an act worthy of imitation; their noblemen are Praslins, their gentlemen Beauvillons, and their Paris street-walker "babbles of green fields," loves lilies, admires nature, and is an unfortunate model of impropriety in action and of perfection in sentiment! Nothing can be more calculated to debauch a population than the French novels, for they place a smiling and beauteous mask over the hideous features of vice and crime; they serve to delude the reason, whilst they excite the passions,

these abused autos were written. The following are the concluding lines to one entitled "*El arbor del Mejor Fruto*."

"Un singular, un celestial Madero,
Con dulce Fruta en su sazón cogida,
Antidoto hà de ser de aquèl primero,
Porque à uno Muerte dè, y à otro dè Vida:
Y quando el parasismo vea postrero,
La Fabrica del Orbe desunida,
Los Dichosos seràn los Senalados,
Quando con èl à Juyzio sean llamados."

Calderon, Autos Sacramentales, Vol. ii. p. 279. Madrid Edition, 1717.

As to ancient Spanish poems in honour of the Blessed Virgin, See *Clarus, Darstellung der Spanischen Literatur im Mittelalter*, vol. i. p. 254, 255; and as to the Autos, Vol. ii. p. 346, et sequent: a book that is not written in a Catholic spirit, but still containing facts not easily accessible elsewhere.

and are thus solely suited to make men miscreants, and women strumpets. Intended to demoralize France, universally read in France, they have demoralized France; and the penny translations of them, which are to be found in every cheap publication shop, have produced already their sad results in England. There can be no doubt, but that they aided in placing Hocker on the gibbet; and recent criminal trials have proved that their perusal has contaminated the minds of some of the young amongst the industrial classes.

How different is the treatment of the same subject by the Spanish novelists. Whilst the reader is amused by the description of the tricks and devices of sharpers and she-adventurers, no false colouring is cast over their actions or their motives. They are made to appear in the fanciful tale as they are in real life, odious and contemptible; and a moral is always attached to their misdeeds, so that he who peruses an account of them is likely to find, that whilst he has been amused, his virtuous principles and good resolutions, so far from being shaken, have been strengthened. Their treatment of the same topic is as different, and there is as great a contrast between them and the French novelists in the management of the same class of characters, as there is between "*Jonathan Wild*" as he appears in the comic pages of Fielding, and the same "*Jonathan Wild*," when fancifully and melo-dramatically depicted by Mr. Ainsworth, in his mischievous and almost Gallic romance of "*Jack Sheppard*." A nation may not admire the genius, nor respect the manners of its neighbour, whilst experience has proved that popular prejudices are never sufficiently strong to prevent it from imitating the frivolities or from practising the vices of the foreigner.

The impure novels of irreligious France, have had sufficient sway over the English mind. Let us see if their place cannot be supplied by something better from Catholic Spain.

There are two reasons why we think that Spanish novels, if translated into English, would be popular. The first of these reasons is, that we believe they would please by their newness of thought, and their unused, because unknown, mode of giving expression to habitual feelings. The purity of their Catholicity would confer upon them a novelty that could not fail to make them acceptable to the English reader, whose mind has been trammelled into heresy by

the common places of the light literature with which he has been supplied. To a person who had been protestantised from his birth by slanderous romances, and libellous novels, and foul tales about "monkery" and "popery," "the inquisition" and "idolatry," and "worshipping the Virgin Mary," how curiously startling would appear a romance concluding like that of "Eduardo, rey de Inglaterra," or a novel terminating in a manner similar to that of "Fuerza del Amor."

"The exertions which our heroine had made to resist the importunities and evade the courtship of the king, the persecutions to which she had been exposed, and the patience with which she had endured them, should be lessons to every high born virtuous maiden, that the preservation of honour is preferable to that of life; and that at all times, in all places, and under all circumstances, we should seek the aid and invoke the protection of God, through the intercession of His Most Holy Mother; and that so living, and so aided, we, like her, may hope to see our good wishes fulfilled, and our just desires gratified."—AGREDA Y VARGAS, *Eduardo rey de Inglaterra*, pp. 73, 74.

"Laura looked back upon the past, and was filled with fears as to the future. No offer that the world could make would be accepted by her. The resolution which had been so long entertained, recent events had only served to confirm. She declared that she would now do that for God, ever the most kind, the most constant, and most tender of lovers, which she had been at one time willing to do for an ingrate, by devoting herself thenceforth solely and singly to His service. This resolution she carried the self-same day into execution, by becoming an inmate of the noble, splendid, and holy Convent of the Conception."—MARIA DE ZAYAS, *La Fuerza de Amor*, p. 31.

This Catholic sentiment breaking out in tales which are not professedly religious, and that, in truth, may be said to have nothing to do with religion, and that are not tinged even in the most remote degree with a shade of controversialism, would, we are sure, produce a good and salutary effect upon the mind of every reader; and be suggestive to numbers who sat down but to wile away an idle moment, to give thenceforward many an hour, many a day, and mayhap many a year, to serious thoughts on religion and eternity.

Another reason why we think that the Spanish novelists, if translated into English, would be popular is, that no nation has a keener sense of humour than England. If

not its best, certainly its most popular writers, are those distinguished for their wit and drollery. Fielding and Smollett are more read though less praised than Milton and Pope; "the Rejected Addresses" will outlive many of the grave authors they parodied; and our comic hebdomadal visitor "Punch," rivals the circulation of "the Times," and his cuts and comicalities never grow old in the public estimation, whilst many a diurnal sheet of "great news," and "important intelligence," is in the course of "a little month" already antiquated.

Bearing this fact in mind, we assert that there is no light literature of any country equal to that of Spain, in its rich humour, its pure wit, its quaint and sometimes exaggerated comicality, carrying burlesque frequently to extravagance. The fault to be found is, that the Spanish wits are too witty, their "flashes of merriment" do not merely dazzle you with their brilliancy, but they sometimes confuse the senses by their blinding brightness. When once the Spanish novelist is fairly engaged with a favourite theme, he gives free scope to his fancy, and does not care to place the slightest check on the thoughts that seem to hurry him along.

An illustration of these remarks will be found in the following extract. It is Quevedo's description of a penurious schoolmaster.

"It was on the first Sunday after Lent, that we entered the habitation of the Licentiate Cabra, a person who undertook the duties of boarding and teaching young gentlemen. When we had passed the threshold, we found that we had fallen into a den of famine, for the economy of its arrangements was not mere thriftiness, but the very acme of niggardliness. The proprietor of this establishment was an ordained pop-gun—a thing that superabounded in nothing but length—a man with a little head, and that little head covered with a shock of hair, and that hair red, and that red being a colour which the proverb prewarns us is so indicative of evil in its wearer, that we should have neither cat nor dog of the same hue. As to the man's eyes, they seemed to have run away from his forehead, and hidden themselves in the nape of his neck; to look at them, they seemed to lie at the bottom of two baskets, and they were so dark, so obscure, and so devoid of the light of day, that they appeared best suited for a roguish mercer's windows; his nose was something between a hook and a cock, with the disadvantage of the bridge being frost-bitten; as to his beard, it seemed to have grown pale from fear of being always so close to his lips, and as if it were animated with a constant dread of being clean eaten up by

his mouth ; for the mouth itself looked as if it were in a constant state of madness from hunger. And then his teeth, most of them had left him ; some I suppose had dropped off in order that they might enjoy the happiness of quitting him, and others I imagine he had himself got rid of as idle vagabonds who had nothing to do. As to his throat, it was as long and thin as that of an ostrich, and the apple of the throat was so prominent, that it looked as if from sheer necessity, it was on the point of starting away from him to seek for something to eat. His arms were dry, and his hands were not hands, but thin twigs tied on to his wrists. To look at him from the waist downward, he seemed to be a moving table fork or compass, so wide did he straddle when he attempted to walk on his weak, withered, long, and shapeless legs. He seldom attempted to run on the self-same legs, and whenever he did so, his bones rattled like dice in a box. Even his very voice was in a consumption ; but then his beard was burly, simply because he would not cut it, and he would not cut it, because he did not like to part with any thing. He had, to be sure, an excuse for this, that he had such a horror of seeing a barber's hands on his face, that he had rather be shot than shorn. It must however be admitted, that he let some one else's servant boy occasionally clip the hair of his head, because he could get that done for nothing. He had a cap to wear on sunny days, and this cap was gnawed with a thousand rat-holes ; its only garnishing was grease, and it was nothing more than a composition of cloth and dandruff. As to his cassock, it was not merely a curious thing, but some went so far as to affirm that it was a miracle, because no one could ever venture to affirm either what it was made of, nor what was its colour. A few indeed, who observed that it was absolutely napless, maintained that it was made of frogs' skins ; others as boldly declared that it was a complete and perfect illusion, for when you saw it near you, you would swear it was black, and at a distance, you might be equally positive it was a sky-blue. Whatever it was, he always wore it unbound by a girdle, and unrelieved by a neck-band or wrist-band. To look at him in his long hair, and with this short and miserable cassock, he might well be mistaken for the lackey of death, whilst he walked in shoes, each of which was wide enough to serve for the tomb of a Philistian.

"As to this man's room, there was not as much as a spider's web in it, whilst the rats were spell-bound upon approaching it, and dare not penetrate within the charmed precincts where a few crumbs were to be found, which he kept guarded with lock and key. His bed was on the ground, and he always slept on one side when he was in bed, for fear of wearing the sheets. In fine, he was arch-poor and proto-penurious.

"It was into the power and under the jurisdiction of such a wretch as this, that poor Don Diego and I had fallen. Upon the night of our arrival he showed us to our room, made a speech to us, and it was a very short one, for he did not wish to give away even

his time or his breath to others without charging for them. He told us what we had to do, and this occupied us the next day, until the hour for eating came. We went to the room in which the young masters sat at the table, and we, their servants, had to wait on them. The refectory was a small narrow hole of room, that looked as if it would not hold more than half a peck of any kind of victuals. A table was laid there, and five young gentlemen were seated around it. The first thing that I looked about for was, to see if there were any cats. Observing none, I asked the cause of their absence from a servant who was manifestly an old one in the house, for his thin features and his lantern jaws bore evident marks of the *boarding* school in which he had been nurtured. 'Cats,' said he, and his heart seemed to break as he gave utterance to the words; 'Cats! Ah, who ever yet heard that cats liked hunger, that they had a passion for fasting, and a desire to pass a life of penance? Your jolly face and fat figure, show that you are a complete stranger to this house, young man.' And with this he began to grieve for himself, and I must own to frighten the very life out of me, for when I looked round the room, I observed that they who had preceded myself and my master as pupils in this school, were as thin and sharp as awls, and their unhappy faces looked as if they had been all rubbed with diaculum.

"The Licentiate Cabra sat down to table and said grace, and then they all partook of a meal, which might be compared to eternity; for as a meal, it had neither a beginning nor an end. Broth was first brought in wooden trenchers, but it was a broth clearly of that description, that there was more danger to a man's life in looking at and swallowing it, than Narcissus experienced at the fountain. I could not but note the anxiety with which the lean flaccid fingers of each guest went swimming in desperation after an orphan chick-pea, which some wondrous chance had cast amid the thin potation he was imbibing.

"As to the Cabra himself, he finished every gulp of the stuff he was taking with some such exclamation as this:

"Of a verity, there is nothing in the world to equal this pot-luck. Let them say what they will, to eat any thing richer than this is a sin; to wish for any thing more savoury than this is downright gluttony.

"I was busily engaged in cursing him and his philosophy, when I saw enter the room a boy—no, not a boy, but an entity, that was for want of a body, half a spirit, and this thing was carrying in its hands a dish, and on the dish there was something that purported to be intended for meat, but so lean, so thin, so bony, that it seemed to be a part of the fleshless creature that was carrying it. There was served up with this dish a single turnip.

"'What, what!' exclaimed the master, 'have we turnips also to-day? never yet flew the partridge that was equal in flavour,

richness, and delicacy, to a fine turnip. Eat, my dears, eat, it does so rejoice me to see you eat.'

"He gave to each of them a bone, with such a scanty particle of mutton attached to it, that it wasted away into nothing between the vain attempt of scraping it off with their nails, and picking it with their teeth. I will be bound for it that not a morsel of meat ever entered one of their stomachs. Cabra looked at them, whilst they were struggling to extract some nourishment from his dishes, and thus addressed, 'Eat away, eat away, remember you are boys, and boys always have such sharp appetites; eat away, I do so love to see you eat.'

"And such was his language to poor creatures, who were actually yawning from pure hunger.

"At last the meal was declared to be finished, and there were to be seen lying on the table a few scraps of bread, a few peelings of herbs, and two or three bones, when the schoolmaster said, 'These are for the servants, they must eat as well and heartily as ourselves, we certainly can have no desire to stint them in their appetites.'

"A plague upon thee, I mentally exclaimed, and upon all thou hast eaten; for the spectacle of starvation before me, gave me a pain in my stomach to look at it.

"He said grace, and then turning to the scholars observed, 'Come, give place now to the servants, and do you, my good boys, now go and take some exercise until two o'clock, lest all you have eaten should do you any harm.'

"We servants then sat down to the table.....and this is a positive fact, which I am ready to verify upon oath, that one of the servants, a man named Sorre, a Biscayan by birth, had so far forgotten how, and in what manner people should eat, that upon his happening to lay hold of a crust, he put it twice to his eyes, and even with the third offer he was not able to bring his hand with the bit in it straight to his mouth.All this may be easily credited, when I state that which was mentioned to me by Cabra's own servant, viz., that when he first came to the house, he had seen two heavy Flemish horses put into Cabra's stables, and two days afterwards, they were brought a pair of fleet coursers, so light and so empty, that a blast of air would blow them off the face of the earth; and the same man added, that he had also known two strong lusty mastiffs, by stopping in Cabra's house for something less than three hours, turned into a brace of lank greyhounds.....These are things, I may add, which I do not know of my own knowledge, but that being told, I believe; but for which however I will not stake my credit, lest it should be said, that I was inclined to indulge in anything like exaggeration."—QUEVEDO, *Vida del Gran Tacano*, cap. 3. Vol. i. pp. 67-70. Barcelona Edition, 1702.

It may be objected that this is pure hyperbole. Admit

that there is exaggeration, still we think it arises from a superabundant wit, and is calculated to provoke the laughter of the reader. It is a species of extravagant humour, which may amuse many and can corrupt none. We may, at least, say thus much of an author, who is denounced by Senor de Ochoa as a mere trifler in words, as a poor spirit, who contents himself with a mere play upon phrases.*

Quevedo, we avow, has great merit in our eyes. He is thoroughly orthodox. In one of his descriptions of the lower regions, he depicts the arch-heretic Luther as being properly deposited "in his own place;"† whilst his satire is pure, the morality healthy, the descriptions agreeable, and the general reflections applicable to all times. A few extracts will, we trust, be found sufficient to justify us in making this assertion.

"I arrived," says Quevedo, who describes himself as travelling through the regions of Pluto, "at a very dark cell, where I heard a frightful noise made by the clattering of fetters, the rattling of chains, the roaring of fires, the cracking of whips, and the piercing cries of those who seemed to be suffering great agony. Upon asking what was the meaning of all this, I was told that this was the place of punishment of 'the Oh!—that—I—had—buts.' I assured the person who told me this, that his explanation was altogether unintelligible. 'What,' I asked, 'is the meaning of the Oh!—that—I—had—buts?'

"These," it was replied, 'are fools who lived wickedly, and doomed themselves to eternal punishment without ever intending it; and hence it is that they are always heard saying, 'Oh! that I had but—been silent; Oh! that I had but—been kind and compassionate to the poor; Oh! that I had but—abstained from touching the property of another.'

"Filled with terror, I fled from this abode of the blind and foolish sinners, and yet was destined soon to meet with others who

* "He aqui otra muestra, que mas bien es una caricatura, de uno genero que tambien cultivaron mucho nuestros autores del siglo xvii. y en el que Quevedo llego al *non plus ultra* de la perfeccion ó, mejor dicho, de la extravagancia. Aqui tenemos, llevado al mas alto punto de la exageracion, el abuso de los equivoccos, de los retruécanos y de toda especie de juegos de palabras y de trabucamientos de ideas."—Ochoa. Note on the *Novela del Caballero Invisible*, Vol. iii. p. 59.

† "Al cabo estava el maldito Lutero hinchado como un sapo, y blasfemando."—*Las Zahurdas de Pluton*, Vol. i. p. 45.

were worse treated. Upon asking a demon what sort of persons these were, 'In sooth,' answered the demon, 'these are a certain class of persons, that had been always talking of God's mercy.'

"'Why,' I exclaimed, 'you talk like a devil.'

"'Aye,' he replied, 'and you like a fool.' Here are the people when they do any thing bad, and are bid to repent of it, have a ready answer on their lips, God is merciful. They persevere in evil, they presume on that mercy, and whilst they thus sin and hope, we calculate on having them at last safely landed in our company. The mercy of God is not for those who, knowing its greatness, convert it into a license for crime, instead of using it for repentance, amendment, and their souls' profit.

* * * * *

Near to these there were a few persons who were groaning loudly, and complaining of their misfortune. 'Who are these?' I enquired. 'Alas,' answered one of the unhappy wretches, 'we are persons who have died suddenly.'

"'Thou liest,' said a devil, 'there is not a single mortal here who died suddenly, however unprepared for, or however unthinking he may have been of his last end. How can any one be said to die suddenly, who from the hour he is born sees life departing from him, and is momentarily approaching nearer and nearer to his death? What else do you behold in the world, but funerals, corpses, and graves? What other thing but death do you hear of? To what side can you turn your eyes, that you are not reminded of death? Your coat that grows old, the house that falls down, the wall that decays, nay, your very sleep reminds you of death and imitates it. How then can any man affirm that he has died suddenly, when every thing warns him of death? Cease your bawling then, no one has ever yet died suddenly, but the man who never thought he should die suddenly.'

* * * * *

"This I admitted was a perfect truth, and as I passed onward, I met on the road a great number of devils all armed with sticks, and staves, and long pikes, who were busily engaged in driving out of hell a great many beautiful looking women, and a vast number of very bad lawyers.

"I enquired what was the reason that these alone were driven out of hell.

"'Because,' replied an imp, 'they are of particular service in the world, in increasing the population of hell. The women with their false faces, their factitious beauties, and their high-flying notions; and the lawyers with their seemingly honest faces, and their really dishonest opinions. We send them out of hell, because they send so many more to hell.

* * * * *

"'Here,' said a devil, pointing to the place in which the poets

were confined, 'here is a lot of people who sing about their sins, whilst others bemoan them. Here are fools who can soothe their sorrow with a monody, cheer themselves with an elegy, and avenge themselves with an epigram. If their lady-loves were kind to them, they celebrate their happiness in a sonnet; and if unkind, they abhor the dear creatures in a satire. Never were wretches so laden with heavy burdens as these; they carry about with them green fields, umbrageous groves, and murmuring brooks; they have arms full of emeralds, give away golden hairs, make presents of crystal fountains, and yet have not a shirt to their backs, nor the price of a dinner. They are a gang whose nation and whose creed is a mystery, for whilst they have the thoughts of boors, their language is that of heathens.'—*Las Zahurdas de Pluton*, pp. 30, 31, 36, 38.

We pass now to another author whose wit is less sparkling, and whose humour is much more subdued, when compared with Quevedo. And still, we may venture to ask, what can be more natural than the "solemn fooling" in the following scene, where the parties are a female sharper who has won for herself the name of "the she-fox," and has found her way into the house of an old miser, whose strong box she is determined upon plundering of its rich contents? She has captivated him by her personal appearance, and has just won his admiration by a ballad, sung by her whilst pretending to be unconscious he was a listener. The last notes of her song have died away, and the dialogue then proceeds:

"Marquina the miser, observing that she had laid aside her guitar, entered the room saying, 'Happy be the day, the hour, and the minute, on which my eyes, recognizing my own house, were engaged in beholding you, as my unhopd for and unlooked for guest, Oh! most lovely Theodora; for in such blessed occupation of my visual organs, has resulted a knowledge of such transcendent charms, and an acquaintance with such exquisite perfections as you are possessed of. Well indeed may I now regard my abode as a sort of nether heaven, because such an angel inhabits it, such a goddess illuminates it, and so much goodness illustrates it. There can be no exaggeration in the praises I bestow upon you; for if my admiration for you could find expression in words, then Cicero and Demosthenes, with all their eloquence, would fall far short of me in an abundance of phraseology, when pronouncing your eulogy.'

"'Oh, my good sir,' said the pretended Theodora, assuming the semblance of a maiden, embarrassed with her own modesty and diffidence, 'now, in sooth, I see that you do know me, and that in your generosity you proportion your great praises, to the humility

and the insignificance of the person on whom you bestow them. Had I the least notion that you were listening to me, I should never have attempted to amuse myself by such a pastime as music; for you, who must have heard the many and celebrated singers that there are in this large city, cannot but regard my voice as poor, weak, and contemptible. I recognize your superlative generosity, and not your superior judgment, in the compliments you have bestowed upon me. It is, however, the fitting part of the benevolent and the good to favour the humble, and to honour with their laudations those that they perceive are conscious of their defects.'

"'Let us have nothing like compliments in our language to each other,' said Marquina, more inflamed with love than ever, 'I repeat what I have already said. I do most solemnly assure you, Senora Theodora, that although I have before now heard the voices of divine singers in Seville, and some of them are certainly first-rate singers, still yours is equal to the very best of them, and in my opinion, far surpasses the finest of them all.'

"'I kiss your hands,' replied the cunning Rufina, 'for this hyperbolical compliment. I should regard myself as particularly fortunate, if my griefs would permit me to give you pleasure, by the exhibition of my poor accomplishments with this instrument; but, alack a day, my misfortunes are so very terrible, that I only took up the guitar for a moment, to see if I could by its notes obtain a brief respite from the recollection of my sorrows.'

"'In my house,' observed Marquina, 'those misfortunes ought to cease; for whilst you are here, I am ready to devote myself to your service, with intense satisfaction, and the most devoted love; whilst all I ask of you is, to show that you have courage to bear your undeserved mishaps.'

"'I estimate at its highest value,' answered Rufina, 'your generous disposition and your noble offer, because I find that all your good words are decorated by better deeds. As then you bid me be comforted, be assured I shall do my best to comply with your polite request.'"—SOLORZANO, *La Garduna de Sevilla*, cap. 5.

Bouterwek claims for Diego de Mendoza, as the author of "*Lazarillo de Tormes*," the honour of being the inventor of the Spanish comic romance.* The claim we believe to be a just one, although it may be regarded as somewhat inconsistent with the assertion of Cervantes, that he was the originator of Spanish novels, (and "*Rinconete y Cortadillo*" is included amongst these,) because previous to his time, all the Spanish novels were translations from other

* See "History of Spanish Literature," p. 130. Bogue's Edition.

languages, whilst his alone were purely original.* There are few readers of books who have not perused the "Lazarillo de Tormes," as few probably who have not heard of the "Novelas Exemplares" of Cervantes, perhaps as few who have read a translation of them; and yet they are well worthy of meeting with one competent to place them in a pleasing form, and to embody them in a graceful style, in order that they may be duly appreciated by the public. ‡

It is not strange that when neglect and an almost complete oblivion in England, have fallen upon the master writers of novels and comic romances of Spain, that the name of Avellaneda should now be almost unknown, and his work, the repudiated "Don Quixote" unsought for. † The book is an interesting one, it possesses great merits, but if translated, would require a very careful and scrupulous revision. Cervantes was perfectly justified in his attack upon it, for its author, whilst plagiarising the plan which Cervantes had laid down for his romance, abused Cervantes himself. ‡ The book was denounced by Cervantes for some faults, and its author for many vices in style and morals. These charges have been repeated by the admirers of Cervantes, and the obscurity into which Avellaneda has fallen, seems to justify those censures. § The prejudice against Avellaneda is strong, but it is not

* "Yo soy el primero que he novelado en lengua Castellana, que las muchas novelas que en ella andan impresas, todas son traducidas de lenguas extranjeras, y estas son mías propias, no imitadas, ni hurtadas."—Prologue to the "Novelas Exemplares."

† In making this remark, we are aware that the 'Don Quixote' of Avellaneda has been translated into English, and must at one time have been read; for Pope, in one of his poems, refers to an adventure of Quixote which is in Avellaneda, and not to be found in Cervantes. We have never read that translation, as it is denounced in these terms by the Madrid editor of Avellaneda in 1805: "Esta muy lejos de ser traduccion, porque antepone, pospone, quita y anade capitulos enteros, y largos episodios."—vol. i. page 33. There has been a second English translation of Avellaneda during the present century, but it fell still-born from the press. A copy of it will be found in the British Museum.

‡ See Cervantes' Don Quixote, part ii. c. 59; Avellaneda's Don Quixote, Prologue, vol. i. pp. 5—10.

§ See Pellicer's edition of Cervantes' Don Quixote, vol. i. p. cxlv., clvi., clviii., clix., clx., clxxvii.; vol. v. pp. 235—237.

universal; and there have not been wanting critics to maintain that the character of Sancho Panza is more naturally drawn by Avallaneda than by Cervantes himself, in the second part of his *Don Quixote*.*

Sufficient, perhaps, has been observed by us, to excite curiosity as to the work of Avallaneda, and to justify us in giving a specimen of what he has written, as illustrating the humour of the Spanish novelists.

“‘Now,’ said Sancho Panza, ‘if you will let me tell you a tale, which I am ready to tell you—if you will only be silent, and listen to me, it will, I think, be admitted by all the company to be the best tale that ever yet was heard.’

“All present begged Don Quixote that he would give permission to Sancho to tell his story. Don Quixote assented; and then Panza began to hem, and haw, and clear his voice, and at length in a loud voice he thus commenced:

“‘That which will be, will be, and when it happens may it well be; good luck to those that are good, and bad luck to all who deserve it; a fever and a cold to the housekeeper of the curate, a pain in the side to the housekeeper of the vicar, a falling-sickness to the red-haired sacristan, and hunger and pestilence to all the enemies of the Church!’

“‘Did I not tell you,’ said Don Quixote, ‘that this animal would do nought else than insult the understanding of every sensible person, and outrage the feelings of every good man? Mark! what a pack of nonsense he has now given utterance to! He has taken upon himself to commence his tale with a diabolical exordium which is as long as a lent.’

“‘Body o’ me,’ said Sancho, ‘if my accordion is diabolical, its notes are tuned for very bad people. Truth to say, your worship

* “Y en quanto á Sancho; quien negará que está en el de Avellaneda mas propriamente imitada la rusticidad graciosa de un aldeano?” Aprobacion de Don Agustin de Montiano y Loyando.—Avellaneda, vol. i. p. 17.

“El Sancho de Avellaneda es mas natural.”—Juicio de esta Obra. Ibid. p. 21.

“Su Sancho es excelente, y mas y original que el Sancho de Cervantes.”—Ibid. p. 24.

Whatever were the merits or defects of Avellaneda, he commenced a course which has been followed by many others—that of imitating Don Quixote. The most successful of these in modern times is the ‘Sir Launcelot Greaves’ of Smollet; and one by an anonymous author, which we have seen in Dutch, entitled, ‘Don Clarazel de Gontarnos often den buyten-spoorigen dolenden ridder.’

does not treat me fairly ; here you go, plumping yourself into the middle of my story, driving the best part clean out of my head, and setting my wits a wool-gathering. Harken to me, as I hearkened to others. If I don't know anything else, at least I know that it is good manners to be silent when a story-teller is talking. And now, as I was saying, I will tell you such a tale ! There was, good gentlemen, once upon a time a king and a queen, and this king and this queen lived in a kingdom ; and every male person of sense called the king his majesty, and every female who had not lost her senses called the king's wife the queen. And now you must know that this self-same king and this self-same queen had a room—it was a great, big room—a room as big as that in which my lord, Don Quixote, stables his Rozinante, and in this room the king and the queen had a great heap of reals—yellow reals and white reals—and these in such abundance that they reached up to the very ceiling of the room itself. Day followed night, and night followed day, and day followed night again, and so it continued for a very long time, and all these reals were still heaped together, when one day the king said to the queen : I say, queen, see what a horrid lot of money we have got. Now, queen, what do you think we ought to do with it ? what do you fancy we ought to buy with it, so that in a short time we may be able to have a great deal more money than we have now, and thus with more money buy for ourselves some fine new kingdoms. On the instant the queen said to the king : I think, mister king, that the best thing that we could do with it would be to buy a great many sheep ! Then the king said to the queen : No, queen, it would be better for us to buy cattle. No, king, said the queen, it would be far better to buy cloth, and carry and sell it at the fair of Toboso. And thus they went on arguefying and disputing with one another ; and the king saying No every time the queen said Aye, and the king saying Aye every time the queen said No ; until at last they were both of one mind, that what they had best do with their money was to bring it to Castile the Old, where there are a great many geese, and where the birds could easily be bought for two reals a-piece,—and then, added the queen, (for the notion was hers,) we can bring them all to Toledo, where everybody knows that the lowest price that is ever given for a goose is four reals ; and as we can afford to take our time on the road, and make but short stages, they will even lay their eggs and hatch them, so that, before it is long, we shall have ten times as much money as we began with. To make a long story short, the king and the queen carried all their money with them to Castile. They carried every piece of coin they had in cars, and coaches, and litters, and wagons, and on horses, on mares, on he-mules, on she-mules, on big asses, and on little donkeys, and other persons of the same description.'

“ ‘Yes—persons like yourself,’ exclaimed Don Quixote. ‘A

plague upon you, and all who can have patience to listen to you !'

" 'This is the second time you have interrupted me,' replied Sancho ; 'and I really believe it is from nothing more than sheer envy at hearing me tell such a serious story in such an elegant manner. Only wait, however, a few minutes, and you will be at the end of my tale.'

"The company begged of him to proceed, and Sancho, being in excellent humour, resumed his narrative.

" 'Only fancy, gentlemen, with such a heap of money what an immense number of geese the king and queen must have bought. This I know for certain, that their geese covered more than twenty leagues. At last Spain was as full of geese as the world was of water at the time of the flood, or Sodom and Gomorrah of fire and brimstone in the days of Lot. Now, the king and the queen went travelling along with all their geese, even until they came to the banks of a river, which some suppose to be the Manzanares, because the elegant bridge that is built at Segovia shows that at one time or another it was not easy to pass it without wetting your feet. At all events, when the king and queen came to the river, they saw there was no safe passage over it. They both stood on the brink of the water, and then the king looked at the queen, and the queen looked at the king, and then they said to one another : How shall we ever get our geese across this river ? If we once let them loose they will set off with themselves, swimming down the river ; and we might then as well try to catch them as the devil in Palermo ; and if we pass them over in boats, it would take us a full year before we should be able to collect them all together again. Now, said the king to the queen, I think that the best thing we can do is to build a wooden bridge over the river, but, at the same time, one so narrow that only one goose can pass at a time,—thus they can walk one straight after the other, none can go astray, and we shall be saved the trouble of bringing them all over at once. The queen praised the king—the bridge was built ; and then the geese began to pass the river, one after another'——

"With these words Sancho stopped speaking !

"Don Quixote said : 'Pass on you along with them, and perdition to you ! Have done, I say, with the passage of the river, and proceed with your tale. Why do you now stop ? Have you forgotten the remainder of the story ?'

"Sancho looked at his master, but did not say a word in reply to him.

"One of the company, noticing the silence of Sancho, addressed him : 'I pray you, good Sancho, to proceed with your tale, for I declare I think it truly excellent.'

" 'Sir,' answered Sancho, 'I am for doing every thing in its due time. Let the geese pass over the river. As soon as they have passed, I promise I will go on with my story.'

"'But suppose them to have passed,' said another of the auditors to this strange tale.

"'No, master,' replied Sancho: 'geese that covered twenty leagues of land cannot be passed over a river so easily, nor so quickly as you imagine; and as I determined, on commencing this tale, never to finish it until I got the geese across, so I can now say with a safe conscience that, as it will take the geese two full years to go over the bridge one by one, so do I promise, that you shall not have longer to wait than that time, before the present company hear me tell the end of it.'—AVELLANEDA. *D. Quixote de la Mancha*, vol. i. pp. 273—278. Madrid Edition, 1805.

In giving these extracts, it is our intention to show that the Spanish novelists merit more attention, and are deserving of more popularity than they have hitherto obtained in this country. We may err in our judgment, or we may fail in our object, from the inefficiency of our translations; or there may not be that relish for wit and humour in England, which we suppose there is, "*Sópa de mel não se fez pará a boca do asno.*" Should such be the case, then a single extract will suffice to show, that the Spanish writers possess the art of awaking the attention, and exciting the curiosity of the reader.

This extract it is necessary to preface by a brief explanation.

Don Martin, a noble Spaniard, who had distinguished himself in the wars of Flanders, and who purported marrying a fair and lovely lady to whom he was long attached, was on his return to his native land, when the vessel in which he was a passenger was overtaken by a severe storm, and having been driven about for several days, was at last wrecked upon an unknown island. Don Martin and another passenger effected their escape to land, where they wandered about in great fear, lest they should be in a hostile country. At length they encountered a magnificently dressed and noble looking cavalier, who informed them that they had been wrecked on the Grand Canary Island, and insisted that they should return with him to his mansion, and consider it, as long as they choose to remain, as their home. This hospitable offer was accepted, and the story thus proceeds:

"As soon as our heroes had entered the mansion of their host, they at once perceived that he must be one of the greatest and richest men in the island; for all the chambers were decorated

with magnificent tapestry and the finest paintings, and such other articles of luxury as serve to denote the superabundant wealth of their possessor. Females appeared before them bearing lights; and these were followed by two young maidens and four white women, whose branded faces proved them to be slaves. The latter came to receive the orders of their master, who told them it was his wish that they should go to their mistress, and tell her that he desired to have two beds made for these strangers, and that both beds should be in the same room, and also that supper should be got ready as speedily as possible, as his guests required both refreshment and repose.

"Whilst these orders were carried into execution, Don Martin and his companion were engaged in conversation with the cavalier; from whose looks, manner, and deportment, as well as from the language he had used towards the slaves in speaking of their mistress, they concluded that not only was he master of the house, but also that the lady to whom he referred must be his wife.

"The supper was prepared, the table laid out, and the strangers were about to take their seats, when circumstances were presented to their sight which excited their amazement, and filled them with doubt and confusion as to what was likely to follow. At the moment that the cavalier desired them to be seated, and that he seemed about to do that which he had already suggested to them, he took from his pocket a key, gave it to a servant, and desired him to open a low, narrow door which opened into the dining hall, and from which the guests supposed they would see coming forth some favourite hunting dog or a pet animal of some description or another. Instead of this, they saw creep forth a woman, whilst on the opposite side of the hall was opened another door, and from it issued a second female. The strange appearance of both—the contrast between them, caused such astonishment in Don Martin and his companion, that they neither knew where they were nor what they were doing, nor how pressing were the invitations of the cavalier that they should at once take their places at the table.

"The woman that had come into the room through the low, narrow door, appeared to be about six and-twenty years of age. She was exceedingly beautiful—so much so, that Don Martin, who had seen the very finest women in the Netherlands and Spain, considered her superior to them all. And yet, with all this, she was so thin, so weak, and so colourless, that she appeared more dead than alive, and looked like one who was upon the point of expiring. Upon her dazzling white and tender person the only covering was a penitential robe of very coarse woollen cloth, which was confined at the waist by a piece of robe, and this miserable habit served her for a chemise, petticoat, and gown. Her hair, which might well be compared to the richest burnished gold, was parted into tresses, and being worn as if she were a peasant girl, fell in long locks behind

her ears, whilst a portion of the head was partially concealed by a small coarse linen hood. In her exquisitely fair hands, that looked like pure flakes of snow, she carried a skull. Don Martin was deeply affected upon perceiving that tears, which seemed to him to be beads of orient pearls, fell fast from the eyes of this charming creature, who, if she looked so lovely in the horrid dress she wore, would, he was convinced, if properly apparelled, appear the finest woman the world had ever looked upon. To his amazement he saw this female, as soon as she approached the table, crouch down, and seat herself on the floor beneath it !

"As to the second female—she who had entered by the door on the opposite side of the hall—she was a negress so black, that jet itself might well be regarded as white when compared with her complexion. And along with this she was so proud-looking, that Don Martin thought, if she were not the devil himself, she must be very like him. Her flat nose and wide nostrils made her have the look of a bull-dog, whilst her projecting mouth and heavy, bearded lips gave her the appearance of a lion, and all parts of her person were conformable to these disgusting features. Abundance of leisure was afforded to Don Martin to notice her face and costly dress, for it took some time before she reached the table, as she was preceded by two damsels bearing wax-lights in silver candelabras. This fierce and abominable negress wore a gown and train, with pointed sleeves of the richest crimson silk, embroidered with gold, and so costly, that no queen could have a richer dress. Her necklace and girdle were composed of the most brilliant diamonds, on her throat there was a band of the finest white pearls, her bracelets were of the largest and best description of pearls, and pendants of rich pearls hung from her ears. On her head were many flowers intermingled with precious stones, and all her fingers were decorated with dazzling rings.

"As soon as she reached the table, the cavalier, on whose countenance great joy was depicted, took her hand, and made her seat herself at the table, and as he did so, said to her, 'Welcome, most welcome, Senora mia !' All then took their places—the negress sitting by the side of the cavalier ; whilst Don Martin and his companion sat opposite to them, but both so stricken with amazement at what they beheld, that they could scarcely think of touching a morsel.

"Their amazement did not escape the observation of the cavalier, but did not the less dispose him to pay a marked and tender attention to his dark and diabolical dame, presenting to her, and making her take, the nicest things on the table ; whilst as to the hapless beauty, who was crouching beneath, bones and scraps, that did not seem good enough for dogs, were cast down to her, and these she, as if she were a mere animal, was forced by her hunger to gnaw at and swallow.

"As soon as supper was over, the negress took her leave of the

strangers and of her husband, or lover, for they could not divine which he was. They saw the negress retire from the room in the same manner in which she had entered it, preceded by damsels bearing wax lights. As to the maltreated beauty who had been under the table, one of the domestics, who had served at supper, took the skull out of her hands, filled it with water, and then gave it back to her, when she instantly returned to her cell, the door of which was then locked, and the key restored to the master of the house.

"This curious scene was over, and the servants had withdrawn to sup, when the cavalier, perceiving that his guests were astonished at what they had witnessed, and yet did not venture to ask him for an explanation, thus addressed them :

"My good friends, I am sure that the dangers of the seas to which you have been exposed, must render rest and repose far more desirable to you than listening to an account of strange adventures. However, I perceive that you are so much astonished at what you have seen in this house, that I can well believe it will not be disagreeable to you to hear me explain the cause of these woe-ful circumstances—or, perhaps, what you may esteem as enchantments, such as occurred in the early ages of the world. I am willing to put an end to that species of mystification which seems to confound your senses. If you would like to listen to it, I am quite disposed to narrate to you my most extraordinary history ; whilst, at the same time, I assure you, that you are the only persons to whom I ever told it, as you also chance to be the very first to see what is a matter of daily occurrence in this house ; and this because, from the period that I withdrew from the city, I have never allowed any of my relations or friends to pass beyond the first hall, whilst, as far as my servants are concerned, there is not one of them who is not conscious, that to speak abroad of anything that happens here would cost him his life.'

"Good Sir, kind friend,' answered Don Martin, 'I beseech of you to speak—I entreat of you to take me out of that state of complete confusion in which I find myself. As to my requiring rest and repose, I assure you I can never know either until I first hear from your lips a narrative in which there are involved such tremendous mysteries.'

"I take for granted that, in thus speaking,' replied the cavalier, 'you give a candid expression to your feelings. I pray, then, for your attention. It happened thus——' "—SAYAS Y SOTO-MAYOR. *Tarde llega el Desengano*, cap. iv. pp. 47—49.*

* This writer is one of the few whose works, if translated, would require a stern judgment to be exercised over them before committed to the press. See *Foreign Quarterly Review*, vol. ii. pp. 498—502.

If this extract has been read with one tenth of the interest with which the original was perused, it will be in itself a refutation to Don Eugenio de Ochoa, in whose "Tesoro de Novelistas Espanoles" we find it. He disparages his own selection by declaring that there is no lively interest felt in the perusal of the Spanish novels, and he prefers to them, on account of the vivacity of their action and the strength of their colouring, the modern novels, even though the principles inculcated by the latter be injurious to morality.* The taste of Don E. de Ochoa is no more to be relied upon than his judgment; and we wish to be understood as not sanctioning *his* selection of Spanish novels, when we praise Spanish novelists generally. He has omitted the compositions, or specimens of the compositions, of many writers, which he might well have inserted; and he has inserted a few which ought never to have been republished. He seems utterly unconscionable of the responsibility, here and hereafter, of the man who can circulate his own ideas, and give publicity to the maxims and principles of others, through the instrumentality of the press. We cannot but consider that M. Baudry was unfortunate in every respect in confiding the editorship of the Spanish novelists to Don Eugenio de Ochoa, whose bad taste is exhibited in selecting, for instance, the "Diablo Cojuelo"—a thing of poor conceits and involved language, with the sole merit of having suggested to Le Sage his "Diable Boiteux," and which we remember, when first meeting with it in a separate form, to have abandoned in disgust and despair. Neither would Don Eugenio de Ochoa, if he had a particle of

* "——— No es grande, como dijimos en la introduccion del tomo primero, el interes de ninguna de las novelas que lo componen."———

"——— En una palabra, y digase de esto lo que se quiera, en todas las novelas modernas que la opinion pública califica de buenas y que todos leen (sancion suprema del mérito en esta clase de obras), hay principios, deletereos tal vez, es cierto, hay un objeto, abominable con harta frecuencia, no lo negaremos, y de seguro, que nadie nos gana á lamentarlo, pero es incuestionable que ese vivo y punzante interés, esa fuerza de intencion, digamoslo así, siquiera sea impotente, que campean en primera linea y son un rasgo distintivo y un mérito á nuestro parecer, mas aun, una condicion vital en las novelas modernas, faltan absolutamente en las antiguas."—
OCHOA. Prologue to vol. ii. of 'Novelistas Espanoles.'

judgment, have adopted the "Novella del Caballero Invisible," which he prints, because it will be incomprehensible to foreigners, and probably unintelligible to Spaniards;* neither would he, we believe, if he were animated with the true spirit and thorough feeling of a Catholic, have inserted amongst *his* Spanish novels that which is not a novel, but that had, as it seems to us, one great merit in his eyes, viz. — that it was a composition the circulation of which was prohibited amongst the pious people of Spain.†

Those who seek a knowledge of the Spanish novelists must look for them beyond the collection which Don Eugenio de Ochoa has made. We have not confined ourselves to his book in placing specimens of their style, their genius, and their manner before the public. Compare them as a body with the French modern novels (the objects of Senor de Ochoa's admiration), and we think they will be found in every respect superior. A person can rise from the perusal of them with his mind improved, and not contaminated, as it is sure to be by the abominations of Sue, who, in his "Wandering Jew," attempts to show that the most devout of all works (with the exception of the Bible), "The Imitation of Christ," is a bad and a vicious book! In the Spanish novels there is little danger of the heart being hardened, as it is sure to be by a study of Balzac, whose dismal exposure of the base motives actuating various classes of society is as horrifying as to witness the dissection of the human frame; and every line of whose writings is so imbued with materialism, as to be rank and rancid as the smells of a charnel-house. The reader, also, of the Spanish novel is safe from the seductions of Dumas, and is preserved from the gross indelicacy of Victor Hugo.

* "Pocos extrangeros, por bien que conozcan nuestra lengua, entenderán esta novelita, de la que es probable que tampoco quedan muy enterados, aunque la lean con atencion, muchos Espanoles, tan eumaranado es su language y tan absurdo su sentido."

† "Esta obrita no es propriamente una novela, pero basta que tenga hasta cierto punto la forma de tal, para que esto, unido á la consideracion de ser libro raro y al que ha dado cierta celebridad la circunstancia de haber estado rigurosamente prohibido, nos autorice á incluirle en esta coleccion."—OCHOA. Note on '*Virtud al Uso,*' vol. iii. of *Novelistas Espanoles*.

To promote the circulation of the Spanish novel is to aid in doing some good; to counteract the circulation of the French novel is to assist in preventing a positive evil: and we shall consider that we have not lost our time in penning this article, if a few months do not pass away until there be seen a fitting translation of some of the best Spanish novels.

There is hope in such a thought, and there would be a great consolation in seeing it realized; for if a portion of Livy has been lost, and a part of Petronius Arbiter retained, still there is a satisfaction in considering, that time, which has destroyed some things that might have been of value, has certainly aided in casting into an irremediable oblivion the Sybarite stories and the Milesian tales.

Prone as man is to vice, still the history of literature must show us, that there is in him so much of the spark of the Divinity that he will not, even in the darkest times of superstition and idolatry, embrace and cherish vice for its own sake; that if it be not allied with imagination—it may be a perverted and diabolical imagination—but still, if it have not that lurid light to irradiate it, he will cast it from him, and consign it to forgetfulness. Sin brings with it shame, and is always followed by horror; and they, indeed, are amongst the most miserable of the race of mortals who have employed their intellect and exercised their ingenuity in popularizing the indulgence of the passions, and who in their tombs still plead for the perpetuation of vice, and corrupt the minds of the young, when they themselves have stood for years—perhaps for centuries—before the awful judgment-seat of their God.

Alas for the world! and alas for themselves! that all writers of novels and romances were not, and are not, animated with the Christian sentiments of the noble-hearted Cervantes: “Una cosa me atreveré a dezirte, que si por alcun modo alcançara, que la leccion destas Novelas pudiera induzir a quien las leysera, à algun mal desseo, ò pensamiento, antes me cortara la mano que las escribi, que sacarlas en publico.”*

* “One thing I will presume to say for myself, viz., that if I believed that the perusal of these novels could excite a single criminal desire, or one evil thought in the mind of any reader, I would rather my hand were cut off, than have written or committed it to the press.”

- ART. II.—1. *Antiquariske Annaler*.—*Antiquarian Annals*. 4 Vols. 8vo. Copenhagen: 1816, &c.
- 2.—*Nordisk Tidsskrift for Oldkyndighed*. — *Northern Journal for Archaeology*. 3 Vols. 12mo. Copenhagen: 1822, &c.
- 3.—*Annaler for Nordisk Oldkyndighed udgivne af det Kongelige Nordiske Oldskriftselskab*. — *Annals for Northern Archaeology, published by the Royal Northern Archaeological Society*. 4 Vols. 8vo. Copenhagen: 1836-1843.

WERE we to enumerate all the works that have appeared during the last thirty years on the antiquities of the North of Europe, the catalogue alone would exhaust the patience of our readers. The copious literature of Iceland has hitherto remained almost entirely sealed to the English student; the learned men who have adorned the Catholic Church in every age have never turned their attention to the treasures contained in a tongue so little known and appreciated; and the early struggles of the Church in these distant and rude countries, have been recorded only in the cold narratives of Protestant historians. These, too, having published their researches in the Swedish or in the Danish language, have remained almost as unknown to the rest of Europe, as those ancient writers whose works they have endeavoured to illustrate. And yet, in the rich and expressive diction of the Icelandic historians, we discover a tone of deep and earnest feeling, a singleness of heart and purpose, and a sweet simplicity, fully equal to that which is so justly admired in our early English annalists.

In the ninth century, as we learn from the Icelandic historians, the faith of Christ was planted in Norway, Sweden, and Denmark, or, rather, it was then partially introduced, by the holy apostle of the North, St. Anscharius. The good saint reaped abundant fruits of his sacred mission in Denmark and in Sweden, but the fiery and predatory Norwegians withstood for more than a hundred years the holy faith of Christ. In 940, nearly a century after the death of St. Anscharius, "Hakon hin Goda," Hacon the Good, endeavoured in vain to induce his countrymen to adopt the christian faith. Hacon had been educated at the court of Athelstan of England, his foster-father, and on his return to Norway he was, though a

christian, elected king. Better had it been for his soul that he had remained a pensioner on the bounty of the English monarch, for, alas! in Norway the evil example and solicitations of his courtiers prevailed, and the king, though he remained in heart attached to the doctrines of Christ, shrank from avowing them openly to his nobles, and with these offered sacrifice to Odin and to the other heathen deities. As he lay dying after the battle of Stord, he once more dared to express the true sentiments of his belief: "Were a longer life allowed me, I would go to christian men, and pray for pardon of my sins against God; but I have lived a heathen, and as a heathen must be buried,—lay me, therefore, where ye shall judge best."

The romantic, but, we think, well authenticated Saga of Olaf Tryggvason tells us, that the mild sway of Christ was at length forced with the sword upon the heathen Vikings of Norway. For a mission accompanied with violence, no apology can be made, but some allowance must be given for the warlike spirit of an age, where personal strength and the sharp sword, were the strongest arguments with a comparatively illiterate people.

It is not our intention here to follow the gradual establishment of the Catholic faith in the North of Europe,—our object is to show, from the volumes now before us, and from other works to which we have access, how much yet remains in Scandinavia, not, alas! of christian belief and practice, but of catholic memorials in the architecture of the northern churches, and in the numerous relics of a former age of faith yet existing in museums, and scattered over the face of the country.

In Scandinavia, as in all other countries where the so-called Reformation found favour, the possessions of the clergy, the lands held by the monasteries in trust for the poor of the realm, formed the chief attraction for the king and his rapacious nobles; while the people, influenced by their rulers, at length submitted to the new doctrines, as much less galling to the flesh than those they had hitherto professed. From that period down to the present time, the catholic religion has been banished from the Scandinavian peninsula; its exercise is forbidden in Denmark, and in Iceland its existence is a matter of history. Within a year or two, Norway, the most liberal, and, in many respects, the most enlightened of these kingdoms, has

again burst the fetters imposed by Lutheran bigotry, and has permitted the catholic clergy to officiate in her territories; while in Sweden we have just had the sorrowful spectacle of a young artist banished from the kingdom, and deprived of his goods and of all civil rights, for having dared to desert the false standard of his country's established religion. And what is that religion? We speak from personal knowledge. It is a dead letter. Moral discourses, replete with the rationalism of Germany, are heard and are admired in the pulpit: in other parts the sourest Calvinism has found a few disciples; but among the people at large, high and low, merchants and princes, *indifference is the only faith*. "We believe there is a God," said a learned professor of Copenhagen to us, "but as for Christ, we are quite *tolerant* on that point." What morality results from such a negative faith may easily be imagined; and the reader has but to peruse the accurate pages of Samuel Laing to be convinced that, as a moral kingdom, Sweden does not stand high among the nations of Europe. In the mountainous districts the religious observance of Sunday is still pretty strictly maintained, though not with the pharisaical severity of Scotland; but in the towns, as in Copenhagen, &c., the shops are open, the peasants are busy in the market, the people swarm to the tea gardens, to the theatres, and to the parks—everywhere, indeed, but to the church.

Amid this general wreck of belief and practice, little could be expected to have been preserved to mark the former existence of the catholic faith, and that little would long ago have entirely disappeared, had not a wise Providence raised up an interest in catholic memorials, out of the evil soil of national pride and vanity. An increasing degree of attention has of late years been directed by Danish and Swedish writers to the ecclesiastical remains of Iceland and Greenland, as illustrative of the works of the Icelandic historians. To understand these authors, many of whom were priests or monks, the northern archæologists of the present day have found it necessary to be thoroughly conversant with catholic rites and observances; and to this zeal, then, for the illustration of the ancient writings, and not, we think, from any reverence for, or due appreciation of christian art, are we indebted for the preservation of numerous objects connected with catholic worship in Scandinavia and in Iceland. Even the remote

and sterile shores of Greenland have been searched for relics of the early colonists; and what are the remnants hitherto discovered? They are almost all stamped with the sign of the catholic faith. Tombstones, marked with the holy emblem of our salvation, or bearing the name of the deceased, with the touching prayer of "God rejoice their souls;" the walls of churches (one yet stands at Kakortok), evincing in their form and arrangement for what rites they were designed.

The volumes now before us are by no means expressly devoted to christian antiquities, but they contain many notices of churches, some few of peculiar ritual observances, and innumerable descriptions of objects connected with catholic worship, and still existing, either in the churches for which they were originally designed, or secured from further dilapidation in the museums of Copenhagen, of Stockholm, Christiania, or of Lund. In these collections we find triptychs, chalices, crosses, reliquaries, vestments, and inscriptions,—all so truly catholic in every regard, that we have good reason to rejoice in their preservation. It is a prevailing opinion with many in England, that the northern nations never fully adopted what they are pleased to call the superstitious yoke of Rome; that the churches of Scandinavia were, for the most part, bare as a Scottish meeting-house, and that they exhibited few or no *marks of the Beast*, in the shape of images, crosses, or inscriptions, illustrating the pious practices of catholics. With good old Göransson, they would believe in the existence of a patriarchal age of purer faith in Scandinavia at a date somewhat anterior to the building of Solomon's temple, to which that credulous, though diligent, antiquary would refer many of the evidently christian inscriptions yet remaining in the country. We could easily refute this opinion by a simple reference to the ecclesiastical history of the northern nations contained in the engaging pages of the Icelandic historians; but to these we shall not at present have recourse. We shall confine our observations solely to the details contained in the volumes before us, and in the works of other Swedish and Danish antiquaries.

That the churches of Scandinavia cannot vie in architectural features or proportions with a Winchester, a York, or a Durham, we readily admit; that the details of their construction and ornamentation are often coarse and rude,

we will not deny; but that they are eminently catholic in their form, and catholic, too, in those remains they still possess of ante-reformation date, we do not hesitate to assert. Nay, in many instances we may add, that more remains of the peculiar attributes of catholic worship are contained in these rude churches, than in the more elaborate edifices of England. But little, indeed, seems to have been destroyed, when the negative doctrines of Luther were introduced into the North. In many of the churches we ourselves have seen the triptych yet remaining on the altar; the enamelled cross, with the images of our Lord and of His blessed Mother and St. John, standing in front of or upon the tabernacle, the door of which was still open, as though inviting the return of the Lord of Hosts to His desecrated altars. Nay, in some instances even the ciborium remains in the tabernacle, but it has stood there, an empty piece of furniture, unhonoured by the bread of life for the last three hundred years.

To enter here into architectural details regarding the northern churches would be scarcely in place: other forms of religious belief, as we see now exemplified in England, can build stately and rich churches, with ample chancels, separated by a screen from the body of the edifice. Yet that screen bears no image of the crucified Redeemer—the holy water stoup has not yet been attempted—the piscina is indeed placed on the right hand of the solitary altar, but for what use no protestant of the Church of England can explain. Elegant and rich brasses have been recently sculptured with vast labour, and adorn the churches wherein they are laid down, but their inscriptions are not catholic,—they breathe no prayer for the departed, they express no hope that the petitions of the living can avail the soul in the other world. That such were not the feelings, nor yet was the practice of the ancient Scandinavians, we have abundant proofs in the volumes now before us. Many of the Essays, especially in the *Antiquarian Annals*, the first work upon our list, are devoted to the illustrating and explaining of the Runic inscriptions, still so numerous in Sweden. Of these almost imperishable memorials, no fewer than thirteen hundred have been discovered in Sweden, Norway has afforded about sixty, thirty have been described from the Danish Isles, and forty more from Jutland, while Schleswig and North Germany contain only about half-a-dozen. Iceland,

the birthplace of the Sagas, has but few Runic monuments. Finn Magnusen (*Antiq. Annal.* vol. iv.) reckons but nineteen in that country, though some of these are extremely interesting and important. It is probable that many more Runic inscriptions were defaced in Iceland about the period of the Reformation, for the same author informs us that, shortly after the introduction of Lutheranism, all Runic writing was strictly forbidden, as "heathen, magical, and pertaining to the black art!!!" In England Runic literature has been almost as little studied of late years as the black art itself; and they who have undertaken the task of deciphering the characters, have complained that the inscriptions, when made out, were rarely, if ever, of any historical value. To a protestant, indeed, we will readily grant the truth of this assertion; to the catholic it is far otherwise. In these almost imperishable memorials, nearly all of which are grave-stones, raised over, or to the memory of, departed friends, we find the most convincing proof, that the fire of the faith burned as bright in the heart of the Norwegian and Swedish peasant, as in the courtly halls of England, or under the more fervid sun of France and Italy. Had every catholic memorial, as in desecrated Scotland, been carefully rooted out from the churches of Scandinavia, still, in the simple, touching inscriptions on these grave-stones, there is abundant evidence, that Sweden was once as truly Catholic and as earnest in the faith, as is Ireland or the Tyrol at the present day.

To some—perhaps to many of our readers—Runic writing is probably unknown, and may require a few words of explanation. *Runic is no language*; the inscriptions are in various tongues, mostly indeed the ancient Norse or Icelandic, but we have also Latin inscriptions engraven in Runes, and sometimes Runic and Latin letters are curiously intermixed. The ancient Runic alphabet is thought to have consisted of only sixteen letters, but it was subsequently increased. The Anglo-Saxon Runes are somewhat more complex than the Swedish, or (as we should more properly term them) the old Norse, and we possess a few examples of these Runes in England and in Scotland. The Runic inscriptions on the beautiful crosses in the Isle of Man are Norse Runes, and the language they are written in is the old Norse, which is nearly akin to the Icelandic of the present day.

We have given to the Runic monuments of Sweden and of the North, the appellation of grave-stones, but more strictly they should in many cases be termed "Inscribed Rocks," for the letters are often cut on rocks of considerable size, where there are little or no vestiges of a grave in the immediate neighbourhood. Amid these numerous inscriptions there are but very few that refer to individuals well known in history; most of them seem to have been cut by simple peasants to the memory of their departed friends or relatives. Sometimes, as in Drontheim Cathedral, and in Southern Sweden, we find oblong slabs, exactly resembling those so frequent in the North of England; bearing crosses and inscriptions in Runes, but more frequently, especially when the cross is floriated, the inscription is in black letter, or in Lombardick characters. But far more general is it to find the Runic inscription cut on a rough unhewn stone, probably taken from the nearest rock, and raised over the grave of the deceased. Rude as these memorials are, they are rarely devoid of some attempt at ornament. The design within which the inscription is usually carved, is almost always in the shape of an interlacing serpent, or several figures of this nature are intertwined. On many of our Norman and supposed Anglo-Saxon monuments in England, a similar figure may be observed. The letters are cut between the two lines which indicate the body of the serpent, usually commencing at the head of the animal. The form of the cross too, which is to be seen on more than one half of the monuments, is also peculiar. It is almost invariably the Maltese cross; we have rarely, if ever, seen on these Runic monumental stones, the floriated cross of the English sepulchral slabs. Though we have called this the Maltese cross, it differs from that well known form in the arms being each separated from each other, and the lines of each limb are so cut as that they seem to repose upon a quadrangular plate placed beneath them.

Now from this peculiar form of the Scandinavian monumental cross, a curious theory has been deduced by some of the Danish and Swedish antiquaries. In spite of the obviously christian character of the inscriptions, in despite of this figure frequently occurring on stones where the name of Christ and of his blessed Mother are mentioned and invoked, these learned disciples of Jonathan Oldbuck have attempted to prove, that the figure in question was

not the emblem of our salvation, but the mystic sign of Thor, to whom the ancient Scandinavians, while yet heathens, trusted to drive away evil spirits from the dead. In the *Antiquarian*, (*Annals*, vol. i. p. 171), there is a long and curious essay by Captain Abrahamson to this effect. Nor is this strange notion entirely unsupported by history. We read in the 23rd chapter of the *Saga of Olaf Trygvanson*, that when King Hakon, who had returned a Christian from the court of Athelstan of England, first met his subjects at the great Pagan feast of Lade, Earl Sigurd, his attached follower, reached to him the cup or horn, after having first drank out of it to Odin. "Now when the king took the cup he made over it the sign of the cross. Then spoke Carl of Gryting, 'Why doth the king this? will he not sacrifice to the gods?' Earl Sigurd answered, 'The king has done what all who rely on their own strength and courage will do, he has consecrated his cup to Thor, by making the sign of his hammer over it before he drank.' And that evening all was quiet."

We are glad however to see that this theory is absolutely rejected by Finn Magnussen and the recent Scandinavian archaeologists. Captain Abrahamson suggests, in his curious essay, that the four limbs of the cross are in reality only four stone axes, laid crosswise in honour of Thor. Certainly some very close resemblance may be traced to the form of the axes so commonly found in heathen graves, and which are identical with the weapons termed celts in this country. But all this ingenuity of argument is of no avail against the one plain fact, that the inscriptions on the same monuments are evidently Christian and Catholic. It is to these that we would now call the reader's attention. Many of the stones bearing Runes are to be found in the church-yards, several have been at different times built up into the walls of churches, while others are scattered over the face of the country, and often are far removed from any present human habitation. We have already stated, that most of these memorials have been raised by simple peasants; the very homeliness of the language bespeaks the writer's total ignorance of courtly epithet or fulsome praise; but the noble testimony they bear to our Holy Faith, redeems their rudeness of expression.

That the ancient Christians of the North did not always bury in consecrated ground, is evident from their histo-

rical records. Many Christian kings and heroes were buried in cairns or barrows; thus Eric Rosenkrantz, who was the first of his race to adopt the Christian Faith, was nevertheless entombed in the cairn of his heathen ancestors; and we learn from Olaus Petri, that it was the custom long after the introduction of Christianity, to bury the dead in the neighbourhood of their own dwellings. Even at the late period of the Reformation, an incident occurred which proves this custom not to have been entirely discontinued. A Danish nobleman, Jens or Janus Gägge, had adopted the doctrines of Luther, in so far at least as to exhibit the bitterest hatred against the Catholic clergy. He still however attended on Sundays the service of the church at Kageröd in Skone, but for the especial annoyance of the pastor and of the congregation, brought his hounds with him into the temple of God. Admonitions in private were disregarded, and one Sunday the priest John, the last Catholic pastor, denounced him as contumacious from the altar. Janus Gägge sat unmoved till after the commination was read, and then rising up, he presented his carbine at the pastor, who still occupied the pulpit. But an aged peasant boldly interposed, and exclaimed, "Ah, dear lord, would you shoot our good parish priest?" Gägge answered, "And though he were Pope of Rome, or Archbishop of Lund, he shall die;" but the priest, availing himself of this diversion in his favour, had retreated into the sacristy to vest for mass. All again was still, when as Pastor John, arrayed in the sacred robes of his office, had reached the altar, a shot from the murderer's carbine laid him dead upon the steps. Jens Gägge was seized, and expiated the sacrilege with his life. As a last request, he begged that he might be interred on his own land, and not in the church-yard. It was granted, and this worthy apostle of the Reformation slept not in consecrated ground.—(*Sjöborg Antiquar Samlingar*, vol. i. p. 33.)

The sword, so common on the monumental slabs of the North of England, is rarely to be found accompanying the cross, on the Scandinavian grave-stones. Some few of the rocks have rude figures of warriors, horses, and other devices sculptured upon them, but the all-prevailing figure is the serpent intertwined, and the Maltese cross.

Captain Abrahamson's Essay on the Nature of the Inscriptions, in the second volume of the *Antiquarian Annals*,

gives an excellent summary of their general tendency, and most of those that he quotes there, we have verified by reference to the great work of Göransson, entitled *Bautil*, 1 vol. folio, Stockholm, 1750; where not less than 1400 Runic Inscriptions are figured. From this work we shall select a few examples to prove the Catholic tone that pervades the whole. One of the most frequent prayers is that truly Catholic one, "God help his or her soul." Thus in No. 534 of Göransson's work, we read as follows—"Uni caused this stone to be inscribed after Uku his wife. God help her soul." On an oblong stone recently discovered in an ancient burial-ground in Greenland, this prayer is beautifully diversified. The inscription is cut in four lines across the stone and runs thus,—*"Vigdis, the daughter of M —, lies here. God give her soul joy."* (*Glaede Gud sal hennar.*) We find the like in some inscriptions in Norway. Such is the simplest form: in the more extended inscriptions we repeatedly meet with the invocation of the Mother of God. Thus No. 26 of Göransson's *Bautil* is as follows, "*Ketil and Brunketil raised this stone to Ulfilagobir, their Father. God help his soul and spirit, and God's Mother, better than he did himself.*" Such is the frequent and touching prayer, so full of confidence in the mercy of God, and in the powerful prayers of Mary. No. 87, (G:) is of similar character—"God help his soul, and God's Mother. Forgive his sins and grant him paradise." Still more beautiful is the prayer in No. 615, G.—"*Ikult raised this stone to Tuko, let his soul come into light and paradise, and to dwell with Christ, the Lord of All.*" In Wallin's *Runographia Gotlandica*, is the following—"God pardon *Lifraise's* soul of *Lifmortu*, *Nicolas's* son. His nephews raised this stone, and *Bitulf* cut the Runes. Jesus Christ mercy."

The words "pray for the soul," are not common on the Swedish Runic stones, but we find it on the few that remain in Iceland; and a detailed account of them is given by Professor Finn Magnussen in the fourth volume of the *Antiquarian Annals*, p. 343. On one of these, now sadly defaced, are the words, "*bidid fyrí mer,*" "pray for me." And in the church of *Graniardarstad*, in Iceland, is an oblong stone bearing the following, "*Here lies Sigrid, the wife of Biarnar, God give peace to her soul into everlasting hope. Who so reads this, pray ye for her*"

soul." Surely such prayers as these could emanate from none but truly Catholic minds.

But we have evidence among these inscriptions of a singular kind, that the Catholic doctrine of good works being available to the souls in purgatory, was fully recognised by the early Christians of Scandinavia. In a land of furious torrents and difficult mountain passes, no charitable work found more favour than that of constructing a bridge to aid the weary traveller on his journey. And at either end of the bridge was placed a stone, not bearing the proud story that such a bridge had been built by a parish, or by a county, or by a worthy squire or nobleman, as in England; but it implored the prayers of the passing stranger for a father, or for a brother, a sister, or a son, of him who had thus aided the traveller's progress. Hence we often meet with the singular expression, "He made a bridge for his soul," that is, for his soul's sake. Thus, No. 14 of Göransson, tells us that a father "raised this stone for his son Sten, and made a bridge for his soul." Nos. 541, G., and 735, G., mention a hospital being constructed for the same charitable purpose.

No. 41, G., is a fine inscription at the bridge of Skalna, "Justin, and Jurunder, and Bjorn, the brothers three, they raised this stone to Trums their father. God help his spirit and soul, forgive his sins and heal his sorrows. He must lie in earth while all live. The bridge is built before the house. May no cairn on the road-side be better than this." Here we have prayer for the dead, and the cairn or barrow is mentioned as the burial-place of a Christian.

Another bone of contention among the Swedish antiquaries, has been the ambiguous expression, "Han döda i Hvitavadet;" which old Göransson stoutly maintains to mean that the hero thus commemorated, fell at the great battle of the White-waters, which is supposed to have been fought somewhere about the year 200 of our era. As some stones bearing these words are marked also with the Maltese cross, and as they occur too scattered over widely separated portions of the country, we must, if we admit Göransson's interpretation, refuse the Maltese cross as an emblem of Christian burial, and must believe too, that the warriors who fell at the "White-waters," were brought home and interred in their own country. Fortunately the true meaning of this expression is well

known now to Northern antiquaries. It indicates that the individual thus commemorated, died within the year after his baptism, and while he yet wore the white garment with which he had been clothed at the font, on the day of his admission into the church. Many inscriptions commemorate those who had visited the Holy Land; the Runic stone in the park at Dagsnæs records the death of a warrior who fell at Acre in Palestine, fighting against the Saracens. No. 28, G., is to the memory of Bjorn, the son of Ketilmund, and concludes thus, "God help his soul, and God's Mother. He fell in Ireland." Again, No. 27, (G.,) records the death of Akhö, "He fell in Greece. God help his soul." It is well known that a body of sturdy Northmen, formed a corps of the Imperial Guard in the service of the Greek Emperors. On the ancient lion of marble that now stands at the gate of the arsenal at Venice, and which was we believe brought thither from Athens, is a Runic Inscription, cut in an intertwined serpent figure, and no doubt the work of some of the royal body-guard of Northmen. Greece, England, and Ireland, are not unfrequently mentioned in the Swedish Inscriptions.

It is seldom that we meet on these monuments with any expressions derogatory to the dignity of the Catholic belief, but on an elegantly shaped and elaborately figured stone, engraved in Sjöborg's work, is to be found a prayer for vengeance, such as can scarcely be excused even by the barbarous ideas of that age. It runs thus, "Rodvisl and Rodalf they caused this stone to be raised after their three sons, and after Rodfos. Him the Blackmen slew in foreign lands. God help the soul of Rodfos. God destroy them that slew him." Captain Abrahamson details two similar inscriptions, and Finn Magnussen has also deciphered one in Iceland, wherein we read the strange threat, "If you willingly remove this memorial, may you sink into the ground." But this last we may readily pardon when we remember how sacred the graves of the dead have been ever held by all nations. To the Catholic the removal or destruction of a grave-stone, must appear an act little short of sacrilege. Protestants may and do feel indignation when the last memorial of an ancestor, or of a friend, is wantonly destroyed or injured; but with the unknown dead they can feel no communion, no petition for mercy from God, no prayer for the release of the soul from the

pains of purgatory, can find a response in their hearts. With the Catholic it is far otherwise; the destruction of a monument, or the obliteration of an inscription, is regarded by them as a direct injury to the dead themselves. They believe that the souls of those that die in the Faith, may often take their flight from this earth, stained with some lesser faults, which must be purified by the cleansing fire of purgatory ere these souls can enter the gates of paradise. When, therefore, the memory of the dead is blotted out from amongst us, the soul is deprived of the chance of those pious prayers for its release, which are ever suggested to the friend and to the stranger by the sight of these touching memorials and inscriptions.

When Scandinavia was Catholic, the prayers of the passing stranger were earnestly implored for the dead, on the bridges,—at the cross-roads,—and in the lonely paths through the forests. He that has wandered alone through the mountains and valleys of the Tyrol, will often have met, in some sequestered spot, where the loneliness of the scene forces contemplation on the most heartless, with a little cross of wood, and a rude painting thereon, of the faithful suffering in purgatory. And below is generally affixed a board whereon the traveller is prayed to bestow a Pater, an Ave, or a De Profundis, for the souls in purgatory, or especially perhaps for one who has met his death in this lonely spot. Better and more profitable far to all, is such a rude memorial, than the largest and most fulsome newspaper panegyric, recording the virtues and good works of the deceased.

It is now generally agreed among the Northern antiquaries, that the period when these Runic stones were raised and cut, extends from the year 900 to 1350, or even later. This period has been determined in various ways. Occasionally a Runic inscription records the name of some one well known in history, thus the Runic stone at Asum speaks of Archbishop Absalom, and of Esbjorn Mule, as then living, and the prelate is known to have died in 1204, while Esbjorn Mule survived till 1232. Even at a later period than 1350 we find a few Runic inscriptions. Thus, in the church-yard at Lye, we read the following curious record: "This stone was raised by Ruffi the wife to her husband Jacob of Mannagård, who was slain by a stone-shot (*en byrsu stin*) before Wisborg, when king Eric was besieged in the above-named castle, and

there had then elapsed after God's birth fourteen hundred years, and one year less than fifty years (1449.) Pray ye that God pardon his soul, and all christian souls." Amen. Curiously enough the same parish of Lye affords an example of another dated stone, and the date is of the same year, 1449. In the church-yard at Borg, in Iceland, lies an oblong stone bearing the inscription: "Here lies the brave Kiartan." From the Icelandic annalists, we learn that Kiartan was converted to the christian faith in Norway, and on his return to Iceland was assassinated by the hand of his foster brother. He was buried in the church of Borg, and there is no doubt that this stone was placed over his grave. Sometimes, as in the inscription transcribed above, the year is given in full, or on other occasions it is, though rarely, expressed in Roman numerals. But by far the most frequent mode of recording the date, is by giving the dominical and golden letters of the year, and sometimes even the day is indicated by a reference to some peculiar festival or saint's day. In the ruins of St. Clement's church at Wisby, is an ancient stone bearing the date in full of 1190; and there is on this too the petition, "pray for his soul." Perhaps one of the most interesting Runic dates is that on the Opernavik stone in Greenland. This stone was discovered in the year 1823, on the island of Kingitoarsuk, in north latitude 73; it lay close to a mound or watch-tower of stones, erected on an elevated hill at some distance from the sea shore. The inscription is as follows: "E. llingr Sigvats-son, and Bjorn Tortarson, and Henry Osson. On the Tuesday before Rogation day they cleared this spot and raised the watch-tower, 1131;" the date being expressed in Runic letters.

Sometimes Runes were used for a Latin inscription, of which the following, on a bell at Småland is a ludicrous example. "Annus inkarnationis Domini millessimus tutenessimus tritessimus oktavus erat fakta an campana." No doubt the worthy caster of the bell was more at home in his foundry than in his Latin, but this evidently indicates that the bell was cast "anno millessimo ducentessimo trigesimo octavo," or 1238. On another bell at Saleby is the year in full 1228, then in reversed Runes, or from right to left, we read, "Ave Maria gratia plena," followed by "Tionisius sith binitiktus," Dionysius sis benedictus.

We fear that we have long ere this exhausted the patience of our readers, in elucidating a subject to which few

have turned their attention, but we can assure them that we regret not being able to devote more time to these interesting remains of the Catholic faith, in a now exclusively Protestant country. Ere we close this notice, we may be permitted to cast a brief glance over the other ecclesiastical remains, which are mentioned and described in the volumes at the head of this paper.

After the Runic grave-stones, the most interesting memorials, perhaps, are the fonts, crosses, and triptychs, still remaining in the Scandinavian churches. Few of these bear inscriptions. There is a large and curious font in the church of Homsö in Småland; it stands on a quadrangular base, at each corner of which is the figure of a saint. Round the rim of the bowl is cut the following Runic inscription: "I pray you this, that ye pray fervently for the man who made me, Jacob he hight." But a more remarkable baptismal font is that still existing in Aakabye church, in Bornholm; round the bowl of this font are carved eleven arcades or compartments, and in each of them is quaintly represented some passage of the Incarnation or Passion of our Lord. The arches over these compartments are all trefoiled, but are not pointed, while the inscription in Runes and in old Icelandic runs along the soffits of the arch. Though not of high value as a work of art, yet the quaintness of the inscriptions is very remarkable. The font is figured and described at full length in the third volume of the Antiquarian Annals.

In the museum at Copenhagen, are numerous small reliquaries well worthy of the attention of the Catholic Archæologist. Some of these are very elaborate, in the form of houses, shrines, heads, and entire figures. There stood formerly, in the church or cathedral of Roeskilde, a colossal figure of our Lord in wood embracing the cross. A few years ago the Vandals of that church sold this figure to a blacksmith for firewood! As the purchaser split open the head, he was surprised to find that it was hollow, and there lay therein, wrapped in a rich cloth, a most noble cross set with valuable jewels. At the back of this cross was an opening wherein was inserted a splinter of wood, probably a piece of the true cross. The shattered head and the rich treasure it contained are now to be seen in the museum of Copenhagen.

In the same collection is a shrine from the church of Keldum, in Iceland; it is of wood in the form of a house,

and is covered with plates of gilt metal, which are punched out into various figures, representing our Lord surrounded by his angels and the twelve apostles. There are many reliquaries of this kind in the same museum, they generally contain small fragments of the bones or garments of the saints, carefully wrapped in silk and sealed. With them is generally a strip of parchment, on which the name of the saint is inscribed. Catholics will be well aware that such relics are always placed in the altars of our churches, and it is accordingly in such situations that most of them have been found. To describe the triptychs and reredoses, which are still so numerous in Denmark, would be an endless task; we have not, however, observed among these any peculiarities of design which would warrant a more special notice. The curious brass offertory dishes, which are occasionally to be met with in England, are extremely common in Sweden and in Denmark. The letters inscribed on these still continue to puzzle antiquarian heads, but it must be acknowledged that the designs are more curious than beautiful.

In the catalogue of ecclesiastical remains now preserved in the museum at Copenhagen, we find some curious particulars. The catalogue is continued at intervals through the four volumes of the *Antiquarian Annals*. We know not if it was the custom in the English church to form the cruets for the divine service of the mass into the figures of animals. We may be indeed mistaken here, they perhaps were only meant as ewers for holding the water to be poured on the priest's hands at the offertory. At number 1412 of the catalogue, is described a lion of metal, "which was used in catholic times as an ewer (*Vandkar*) at the service of the mass. On the upper part of the head is a quadrangular hole with a cover; into this opening the water was poured, and it was emptied through the mouth of the animal. The tail is bent upwards over the back, and from it extends a winged dragon with its teeth fastened in the lion's neck, and thus is formed a handle for holding the figure. Round the neck is a collar to which is attached a shield bearing the following inscription in Runes: "*Leon thetta er gefet Gudi til dirdar, ok hinom helga Ulaf at Vatsfird e af Thorvaldi ok Thordiso.*" This lion is given to the service of God, and to St. Olaf of Vatsfird by Thorvald and Thordiso." Thorvald Snorrason, as we learn from the Icelandic historians, married

Thordiso, the daughter of the celebrated historian, Snorro Sturleson, in the year 1224, and gave many gifts to the church of Vatnisfiord in Iceland, from whence this lion was sent to the Copenhagen museum. Thorvald died in the year 1229, consequently the lion was presented to this church during the five years that preceded this date. From this stock is descended the celebrated Thorsaldsen, whose glorious creations in marble are so well known to the world of art.

No. 1526 of the catalogue affords an interesting notice of ancient Catholic practice. It is a horn of gilt metal which formerly belonged to the church of Aarhus. Here, and in many other of the northern churches, the last scenes of our blessed Saviour's life were represented on Good Friday afternoon, as in a sacred tragedy, to impress more deeply on the awe-stricken multitude, the inexpressible desolation of their Redeemer's sacrifice. And when the figure of the crucified Jesus was raised high in air before his people, while in solemn silence, and prostrate on the ground, they worshipped their expiring Lord, then broke forth from the roof of the choir a deep despairing voice, as it were the voice of Judas the Iscariot, and in hollow tones it cried, "I did ill to betray innocent blood." Jeg giørde ilde at jeg forraadede uskyldig blod. And from the opposite side of the roof there cried many voices, "Accursed be Judas, the traitor." The horn, above-mentioned, is said to have been used by the monk who personated Judas, for the purpose of increasing the deep and solemn tones of his voice.

In the great cathedral of Drontheim, the corbel heads in the choir are the mouths of tubes which run directly from thence out upon the roof of the building. Can they have been destined to serve on this solemn occasion? Protestant antiquaries might be tempted to assert that these heads were to be used to convey oracles to deceive the credulous multitude. It is strange that no record of such juggleries has come down to our times.

But we dare not pursue further the tempting extracts that now lie before us from these volumes. For the general reader we have perhaps already said too much; the Catholic however will, we are sure, pardon us the fond affection with which we cling to the records of our glorious Faith.

We trust that these brief notices may turn the steps

of some Catholic archæologist towards the hitherto neglected North, may induce him to follow the traces of our belief through the sombre forests of Sweden, or along the rude sea-girt coasts of Norway. We know few subjects of enquiry more full of interest, than a comparison of these remains with the relics of Catholic Ireland, preserved in the Museum of the Royal Irish Academy, in that of Trinity College, Dublin, and in some of our private collections. It were a holy thought too, to pray where good religious once sang the praises of God; it is good to rescue from oblivion all that yet remains of once Catholic Scandinavia. May that land, now so abjectly sunk in Lutheran darkness and indifference, be once more enlightened, and may her desecrated altars be again sanctified by that holy sacrifice, which was once offered throughout the length and breadth of that wild region, in the presence of a faithful and believing people.

ART. III.—*History of the Conquest of Peru, with a Preliminary View of the Civilization of the Incas.* By WILLIAM H. PRESCOTT. In Two Volumes. London, Bentley, 1847.

MR. Prescott is already favourably known to the public of letters, as the author of some historical works and essays, which have at least the merit of being agreeable, if they cannot be called profound. His history of the *Reign of Ferdinand and Isabella* is eminently amusing, and was a desirable addition to circulating libraries and reading rooms; that of *The Conquest of Mexico* met with a kind reception from the leading literary arbiters of criticism, and has, we believe, already reached to a third edition, as we presume we may rely upon the title pages of Bentley. Both are just the sort of volumes we should expect to prosper and sell in an age of superficial literature like the present; for, as we said before, they are eminently amusing, and written in a light, pleasant, easy style, not unfrequently picturesque. To depth or profundity, to manliness or vigour, to accurate delineation of character, or originality of thought, or classic elegance of idea, to statesmanlike reflection, or philosophical observation they

make no pretension, and appear to us to possess no claim.

We are not disposed to be severe on Mr. Prescott. As a general rule, we would rather praise than censure. It would be more consonant to our own feelings to find in this gentleman's volumes materials for eulogy rather than for that "faint applause" which is perhaps the bitterest and most injurious kind of attack to which an author can be exposed. But as just and honest critics we must tell him, that his present volumes come before us with no claim to the first; and that the very slight and questionable merit of having not unskilfully put together a mass of facts which every body well knew before, is all that he can reasonably ask at our hands. There is in this history scarcely anything new—anything which an ordinary knowledge of Herrera, Humboldt, Stevenson, and Robertson, did not already supply. We have a fault also to find with the style of this work, which, in spite of Mr. Folsom's "imprimatur," contains some Americanisms and many inaccuracies, of which we have given a few examples in a note.*

The first European who ever received an authentic account of the existence of Peru, was Vasco Nunez de Balboa, the discoverer of the South Seas—a man like all the other adventurers of those days, of indifferent character, and whose pretended devotion to God and our blessed Lady, was secondary certainly to his extreme fondness

* We intended to have noticed these errors at the end of our paper, but we find we shall not have space. We content ourselves therefore with merely pointing out a few in this note. They are selected from a great many. In vol. i. page 150, Mr. Prescott talks of crossing an "interval." This, we submit, is not English. The entire of page 169 is badly written. Page 208, "he steered in the tract of his comrade," this is not a misprint for it is repeated; it should be *track*. Page 212, last sentence—very careless composition. Page 230, he talks of "mangrove trees with their complicated roots *snerled!* into coils." We suppose he means *gnarled*. Page 411, "the shoes of their horses were *used up*." This is an Americanism. Vol. ii. page 108, "as bold a cavalier as ever crossed to the shores of America." This may be colloquial English, but it is not correct. What did he *cross*? In page 258, there is what we call in Ireland, a regular "bull." Mr. Prescott tells us "the magistrates *took counsel* of Vaca de Castro," while "he maintained a discreet *silence*."

for American women, and *pesos d' oro*. A young barbarian who was present at a squabble which took place between Nunez and some of his followers, for a quantity of gold which they were weighing, struck the scales with his fist, and scattering the glittering metal around the apartment, exclaimed: "If this is what you prize so much that you are willing to leave your distant homes, and risk even life itself for it, I can tell you of a land where they eat and drink out of golden vessels, and gold is as cheap as iron is with you." This information, as may be surmised, greatly excited the cupidity of Nunez, who did not rest, till, having surmounted the rocky rampart of the Isthmus which divides the two mighty oceans, he rushed with sword and shield into the waters of the Pacific, and cried out like another Quixote, that "he claimed this unknown sea, with all that it contained, for the sovereign of Castile, and that he would make good the claim against all, Christian or infidel, who dared to gainsay it." A magnificent vaunt truly, and one, of which Nunez did not comprehend the full import—nor live to accomplish. This unknown sea, with all that it contained, was not explored for many years after the death of Nunez.

In the year 1471, as near as can be computed, for unluckily no record of the interesting event was made, a low amour, between an infantry officer, one Gonzalo Pizarro, and a servant maid, or worse, in the miserable village of Truxillo, produced the conqueror of Peru. So little did his gentle mother occupy her thoughts about young Francis, that he was suckled, as tradition relates, by a compassionate sow, and as soon as he was able to walk and cry out, he was promoted to the honourable condition of a swineherd. This condition of life not suiting him, he ran away to sea; but at what age, with what companions, or on what expedition, whether piratical or commercial, is not known; history, luckily perhaps for him, being altogether silent of his achievements until the year 1510, when he was full forty years old. In what sort of vagabond existence he passed his time up to this period it would be impossible to say; but he rose in the world; for in this year we find him a lieutenant, although without a maravedi in his pocket. No better off was he in 1522, when we again hear of him, concerting with another adventurer like himself, named Almagro, and an enterprising clerk, named Lieque, the subjugation of Peru. These

three gentlemen, having pledged whatever furniture and small credit they possessed, for the raising of funds, and having gathered together as many desperate ragamuffins as they could procure, fitted up a ship, which set sail from the little port of Panamá, in November 1524, carrying Pizarro as commander-in-chief, and which was to be speedily followed by a second caravel bearing an equally precious freight of outlaws under the tutelary protection of Lieutenant Almagro. The clerk prudently remained at home.

This first expedition to the South was anything but propitious. Heavy tempests, the sea lashed into frightful billows that threatened to swallow up his little ship, sinking hearts and a miserable scarcity of food, rendered it on the whole as disagreeable a voyage as possible. His companions murmured loudly, and had half resolved to return to Panamá, careless of the ridicule and the jails (for three-fourths of them were runaway debtors) which there awaited them; but Pizarro, by dint of persuasion and command, induced them to remain a little longer with him, and they took up their quarters at an island where they fared so badly, that, on quitting it for the wide ocean, they branded it with the name of the Port of Famine. They sailed on from this place encountering bad weather as usual, a tribe of man-eaters, several towns, large and small, which they conscientiously plundered of whatever of either food or gold they could find, and after three or four skirmishes, in which they had but indifferent success, they returned to Panamá.

Their second expedition was not one whit less disastrous than the first. It was brightened only by the discovery of Peru by Pizarro's pilot, Ruiz. But they were in too disabled a condition from tempest, famine, and discontent, to reap any advantage from this brilliant piece of fortune. Almagro was again despatched to Panamá for reinforcements, and for fresh provisions, while Pizarro awaited his return on the desolate island of Jallo, where he and his men endured hardships that might have shattered the courage of the bravest. To add to his misfortunes, the governor of Panamá, who had little or no sympathy for either the objects of, or the individuals engaged in what seemed a wild goose expedition, sent a ship manned with soldiers to the island, to bring away by force or persuasion the misguided men, who still cherished dreams of golden

islands and silver cities, and who clung to Pizarro with a fidelity that can only be designated desperate. The latter took little heed of this legation, but announced his own purposes in a manner sufficiently decisive. Drawing his sword, he traced a line with it on the sand from East to West. Then turning towards the South, "friends and countrymen," said he, "on that side are toil, hunger, nakedness, the drenching storm, desertion, and death; on this side ease and pleasure. There lies Peru with its riches—here Panamá and its poverty. Choose each man what best becomes a brave Castilian. For my part I go to the south." So saying, he stepped across the line; thirteen others followed him. The remainder returned to Panamá and to prison.

"'There is something striking to the imagination,' says Mr. Prescott, 'in the spectacle of these few brave spirits thus consecrating themselves to a daring enterprise, which seemed as far above their strength as any recorded in the fabulous annals of knight errantry. A handful of men, without food, without clothing, almost without arms, without knowledge of the land to which they were bound, without vessel to transport them, were here left on a lonely rock in the ocean, with the avowed purpose of carrying on a crusade against a powerful empire, staking their lives on its success. What is there in the legends of chivalry that surpasses it? This was the crisis of Pizarro's fate. There are moments in the lives of men, which, as they are seized or neglected, decide their future destiny. Had Pizarro faltered from his strong purpose, and yielded to the occasion now so temptingly presented for extricating himself and his broken band from their desperate position, his name would have been buried with his fortunes, and the conquest of Peru would have been left for other and more successful adventurers. But his constancy was equal to the occasion, and his conduct here proved him competent to the perilous post he had assumed, and inspired others with a confidence in him which was the best assurance of success.'"—vol. i. pp. 242-3.

Pizarro and his companions now prosecuted their voyage, sweeping abreast of the mighty range of the Cordilleras; Chimborazo, with its broad round summit, towering like the dome of the Andes, and Cotopaxi with its dazzling dome of silvery white, that knows no change except from the action of its own volcanic fires. Sweeping along the splendid ocean, they at length stood in for Tumbes, a considerable town which, seen from the waters, presented to the eye a delightful spectacle of cultivation, happiness,

and wealth. Nor did a nearer survey of it dispel the delightful visions which its distant outline had created. They found everywhere tokens of civilization, treasure, and refinement. They were received with an open, generous, unsuspecting hospitality, which, had they possessed the hearts of men, and not of demons, might have melted them from their predatory purpose. But they saw everything with greedy eyes, and were scarcely restrained from gratifying their gluttonous passions for gold and women by the certainty of instant destruction, for they were neither in sufficient numbers then, nor sufficiently provided with arms and ammunition for any decided attack. They smothered their guilty appetites for a while, and set sail further to the south, making various discoveries along the coast, and, after cruising for some months, returned again to Panamá, after an absence of a year and a half. Pizarro proceeded to the court of Madrid with a dazzling picture of all he had done and seen. He was appointed governor and captain-general of all the provinces he might discover and subdue, together with certain other rights and privileges, appertaining to licensed robbers. After staying in Spain six months, he set sail for Panamá, carrying with him, in addition to a new levy of desperadoes, four other brothers no better than himself.

The condition of Peru, when Pizarro and his party landed in it for the third and last time, was disastrous enough. Huayna Capac, the last monarch of this vast empire, had divided it on his death-bed between his two sons, Huascar and Atahualpa; acting in this, contrary to the fundamental laws of the state, for Huascar was the rightful heir, having been born in marriage, while Atahualpa was the son of a concubine and slave. Scarcely had their father been committed to the last resting-place of the Incas, when a terrible struggle for sole dominion arose between the two brothers, which, after many sanguinary battles, ended in the complete discomfiture and imprisonment of the lawful owner, Huascar, and the usurpation by his brother of the entire empire. The adherents of the former were, however, not idle, though they were subdued. The whole country was in a state of smothered rebellion, kept down with difficulty by the fierce soldiers of the conqueror, and by its internal division and weakness offering to Pizarro the prospect of an easy victory. He lost no time in hastening to the quarters, where he learned

that the powerful Atahualpa was encamped at the head of fifty thousand chosen warriors, flushed with his new triumphs, and haughty enough to bid defiance to the world. The victory of the monarch was by this time complete. He had beaten his enemies on their own ground, had mastered their ancient capital, had trampled on the neck of his brother and rival, and seized the sceptre of the Children of the Sun. But the hour of triumph had scarcely come, when that of his deepest humiliation and disgrace supervened. Darkness and death were already gathering in mists around him,—but a moment, and they burst upon his head, annihilating himself and his empire for ever.

The march from San Miguel, where Pizarro had taken up his quarters, to Caxamalca, the city of the monarch, is one of the most extraordinary on record. It was accomplished by less than two hundred men, horse and foot, over an extensive country, thickly inhabited, across rivers and lakes, through vast forests, and over stupendous mountains,—the great majority of the soldiers knowing nothing of the motives of their commander beyond the fact that he was leading them towards a camp of fifty thousand valiant warriors, under the very eyes of the king of the land, whom recent events had proved to be any thing but scrupulous in his modes of winning power and commanding obedience. It cannot excite our astonishment, therefore, when we learn that they had advanced but a short distance, when murmurs and discontents began to prevail. Pizarro, however, took a short and efficacious mode of silencing both. Calling his men together, he told them that “a crisis had now arrived in their affairs, which it demanded all their courage to meet. No man should think of going forward in the expedition who could not do so with his whole heart, or who had the least misgiving as to its success. If any repented of his share in it, it was not too late to turn back; San Miguel was but poorly garrisoned, and he should be glad to see it in greater strength. Those who chose might return, and they should be entitled to the same proportion of lands and Indian vassals as the present residents. With the rest, were they few or many, who chose to take their chance with him, he should pursue the adventure to the end.” Only nine availed themselves of the general’s permission. Four of them belonged to the infantry, and five to the horse. The rest loudly declared their resolve to follow their

leader. "Lead on," they shouted; "lead on wherever you think best. We will follow with good will, and you shall see that we can do our duty." And they prepared to cross the gigantic steppes of the Andes.

The ascent of these mighty mountains was accomplished with difficulty, but with little loss. The descent was easy and rapid, and they came in sight of Caxamalca, shining like a golden city on the dark skirts of the sierra, while, sloping along the surrounding hills to a vast distance, a white cloud of pavilions was seen covering the ground as thick as snow flakes. It filled the adventurers with amazement to behold the Indians occupying so proud a position. The spectacle caused not a little confusion also, and even fear in the stoutest hearts. But it was too late to turn back or betray the least sign of weakness. With as bold a countenance as they could assume, they descended from the heights, and entered the deserted city. This memorable feat took place in the afternoon of the 15th of November, 1532—a melancholy afternoon for Peru. Though the evening was already beginning to gather in, Pizarro lost not a moment. He despatched an embassy of fifteen horsemen to the monarch. They found him in the midst of his nobles and women of the royal household. They told him that they were the subjects of a mighty prince across the waters, and had come, drawn hither by the report of his great victories, to offer their services, and to impart to him the doctrines of the true Faith which they professed. And they concluded by inviting him to visit them in their present quarters, where the general awaited him. Atahualpa was at first silent; but, on being pressed for some answer, he said: "Tell your captain that I am keeping a fast, which will end to-morrow morning. I will then visit him with my chieftains. In the meantime, let him occupy the public buildings in the square, and no other till I come, when I will order what shall be done." The Spaniards were then offered refreshments, which they declined, being unwilling to dismount. They did not refuse, however, to quaff the sparkling chicha from golden vases of extraordinary size, presented to them by the dark-eyed beauties of the harem; after which they rode back to Pizarro.

The resolve of that daring chief, as soon as the visit of Atahualpa was promised, was at once taken. Now, at least, he was at the crowning point of his destiny. There

was no room for doubt or delay. A moment's indecision, a moment's fear would have sealed his fate for ever, and consigned him with his followers to the dungeon and to death. The known character of the fierce, imperious emperor admitted of no doubt what the fate of the Spaniards would be, if they did not forestall matters by striking the first blow. To fly was now too late. Whither could they fly? At the first signal of retreat the whole avenging army of the Inca would be upon them. The rocky defiles and mountain passes of the Cordilleras, with whose intricacies the Peruvians were well acquainted, would leave horse and foot without even a reasonable chance of escape. Yet, to remain inactive in their present quarters was almost equally as bad. The visits of their Peruvian hosts would in a short time breed that familiarity from which contempt arises; the smallness of their numbers would be noted and despised; their war-horses, now the pregnant source of apprehension on the part of the Peruvians, would soon lose all their terrors, and they would be either cut off in some sudden onslaught, or hemmed in to perish miserably by famine and of fear. To attack the Peruvians in the open field would be little short of madness, nor did it promise any certainty of their being able to seize the person of Atahualpa. To get possession of him in the moment of his confidence in their hospitality, seemed the only positive mode of attaining their ends; and once masters of the monarch, they did not doubt of being able to dictate to the rest of the empire. Their minds, therefore, were resolved upon this head. We may imagine with what beating hearts they retired to rest on that eventful eve, and with what dim fears they must have looked forth on the watch-fires of the Peruvians lighting up the sides of the mountains, and glittering in the darkness, "as thick," says one who saw them, "as the stars of heaven."

"It was noon on the following day before the Indian procession was on its march, when it was seen occupying the great causeway for a long extent. In front came a large body of attendants whose office seemed to be to sweep away every particle of rubbish from the road. High above the crowd appeared the Inca, borne on the shoulders of his principal nobles, while others of the same rank marched by the sides of his litter, displaying such a dazzling show of ornaments on their persons, that, in the language of one of the conquerors, 'they blazed like the sun.' But the greater part of

the Inca's troops mustered along the fields that lined the road, and were spread over the broad meadows as far as the eye could reach. When the royal procession had arrived within half a mile of the city, it came to a halt, and Pizarro saw with surprise, that Atahualpa was preparing to pitch his tents, as if to encamp there. A messenger soon after arrived, informing the Spaniards that the Inca would occupy his present station the ensuing night, and enter the city on the following morning. This intelligence greatly disturbed Pizarro, who had shared in the general impatience of his men at the tardy movements of the Peruvians. The troops had been under arms since daylight, the cavalry mounted, and the infantry at their post, waiting in silence the coming of the Inca. A profound stillness reigned throughout the town, broken only at intervals by the cry of the sentinel from the summit of the fortress, as he proclaimed the movements of the Indian army. Nothing, Pizarro well knew, was so trying to the soldier as prolonged suspense in a critical situation like the present, and he feared lest his ardour might evaporate, and be succeeded by that nervous feeling natural to the bravest at such a crisis, and which if not fear is near akin to it. He returned an answer therefore to Atahualpa, deprecating his change of purpose, and adding that he had provided everything for his entertainment, and expected him that night to sup with him. This message turned the Inca from his purpose, and striking his tents again he resumed his march, advising the general that he should leave the greater part of his warriors behind, and enter the place with only a few of them, and without arms, as he preferred to pass the night at Caxamalca. At the same time he ordered accommodations to be provided for himself and his retinue in one of the large stone buildings, called from a serpent sculptured on the walls, 'the House of the Serpent.' No tidings could have been more grateful to the Spaniards. It seemed as if the Indian monarch was eager to rush into the snare that had been spread for him.

"It was not long before sunset when the van of the royal procession entered the gates of the city. First came some hundreds of the menials employed to clear the path from every obstacle, and singing songs of triumph as they came, which in our ears, says one of the conquerors, sounded like the songs of hell. Then followed other bodies of different ranks and dressed in different liveries. Others were clad in pure white, bearing hammers or maces of silver or copper; and the guards, together with those in immediate attendance on the prince, were distinguished by a rich azure livery and a profusion of gay ornaments, while the large pendants attached to their ears indicated the Peruvian noble. Elevated high above his vassals came the Inca Atahualpa, borne on a sedan or open litter, on which was a sort of throne made of massive gold of inestimable value. The palanquin was lined with the richly covered plumes of tropical birds, and studded with shining plates

of gold and silver. The monarch's attire was much richer than on the preceding evening. Round his neck was suspended a collar of emeralds of uncommon size and brilliancy. His short hair was decorated with golden ornaments, and the imperial *borla* encircled his temples. The bearing of the Inca was sedate and dignified; and from his lofty station he looked down on the multitudes below with an air of composure, like one accustomed to command; as the leading files of the procession entered the great square, larger, says an old chronicler, than any square in Spain, they opened to the right and left for the royal retinue to pass. Every thing was conducted with admirable order. The monarch was permitted to traverse the *plaza* in silence, and not a Spaniard was to be seen. When some five or six thousand of his people had entered, Atahualpa halted, and turning round with an enquiring look, demanded, 'where are the strangers?' * * *

"Pizarro saw that the hour had come. He waved a white scarf in the air, the appointed signal. The fatal gun was fired from the fortress. Then, springing into the square, the Spanish captain and his followers shouted the old war cry of 'St. Jago and at them!' It was answered by the battle cry of every Spaniard in the city, as rushing from the avenues of the great halls in which they were concealed, they poured into the *plaza*, horse and foot, each in his own dark column, and threw themselves into the midst of the Indian crowd. The latter, taken by surprise, stunned by the report of artillery and muskets, the echoes of which reverberated like thunder from the surrounding buildings, and blinded by the smoke which rolled in sulphurous volumes along the square, were seized with a panic. They knew not whither to fly for refuge from the coming ruin. Nobles and commoners—all were trampled down under the fierce charge of the cavalry, who dealt their blows right and left without sparing; while their swords flashing through the thick gloom, carried dismay into the hearts of the wretched natives, who now for the first time saw the horse and his rider in all their terrors. They made no resistance, as indeed they had no weapons with which to make it. Every avenue to escape was closed, for the entrance to the square was closed up with the dead bodies of men who had perished in vain efforts to fly; and such was the agony of the survivors under the terrible pressure of their assailants, that a large body of Indians, by their convulsive struggles, burst through the wall of stone and dried clay which formed part of the boundary of the *plaza*! It fell leaving an opening of more than a hundred paces, through which multitudes now found their way into the country, still hotly pursued by the cavalry, who, leaping the fallen rubbish, hung on the rear of the fugitives striking them down in all directions. Meanwhile, the fight, or rather massacre, continued hot around the Inca, whose person was the great object of the assault. His faithful nobles, rallying about him, threw themselves in the way of the assailants, and strove, by tear-

ing them from their saddles, or at least by offering their own bosoms as a mark for their vengeance, to shield their beloved master. It is said by some authorities that they carried weapons concealed under their clothes. If so, it availed them little, as it is not pretended that they used them. But the most timid animal will defend itself when at bay. That they did not do so in the present instance, is proof that they had no weapons to use. Yet they still continued to force back the cavaliers, clinging to their horses with dying grasp, and as one was cut down, another taking the place of his fallen comrade with a loyalty truly affecting.

"The Indian monarch stunned and bewildered, saw his faithful subjects falling round him without hardly comprehending his situation. The litter on which he rode heaved to and fro, as the mighty mass swayed backwards and forwards; and he gazed on the overwhelming ruin like some forlorn mariner, who, tossed about in his bark by the furious elements, sees the lightning flash, and hears the thunder bursting around him, with the consciousness that he can do nothing to avert his fate. At length, weary with the work of destruction, the Spaniards as the shades of evening grew deeper, felt afraid that the royal prize might after all elude them, and some of the cavaliers made a desperate attempt to end the affray at once by taking Atahualpa's life. But Pizarro, who was nearest his person, called out with a stentorian voice, 'Let no one who values his life strike at the Inca;' and stretching out his arm to shield him, received a wound on the hand from one of his own men, the only wound received by a Spaniard in the action. The struggle now became fiercer than ever round the royal litter. It reeled more and more, and at length several of the nobles who supported it having been slain, it was overturned, and the Indian prince would have come with violence to the ground, had not his fall been broken by the efforts of Pizarro and some other of the cavaliers who caught him in their arms. The imperial *borla* was instantly snatched from his temples by a soldier named Estete, and the unhappy monarch strongly secured, was removed to a neighbouring building, where he was carefully guarded. All attempt at resistance now ceased. The fate of the Inca soon spread over town and country. The charm which might have held the Peruvians together was dissolved. Every man thought only of his own safety. Even the soldiery encamped on the adjacent fields took the alarm, and learning the fatal tidings, were seen flying in every direction before their pursuers, who in the heat of triumph showed no touch of mercy. At length night, more pitiful than man, threw her friendly mantle over the fugitives, and the scattered troops of Pizarro rallied once more at the sound of the trumpet in the bloody square of Caxamalca."—Vol. i. pp. 374-385.

This is well and picturesquely painted; and would, we think, afford a fine subject for the pencil of an artist. The

daring villany of the act cannot be excused; nor does it possess the merit of originality, as the same had been done to the emperor of Mexico by Cortes. They are both, perhaps, the most splendid pieces of criminality in history, but their splendour is only a pitiful excuse for their infamy. We cannot express much sympathy for Atahualpa; he was an usurper, and while he was in the custody of Pizarro, he got his brother strangled to prevent his gaoler from listening to any overtures which he might make to reinstate him on the throne of his ancestors. Treacherous himself, he fell a victim to Spanish treachery. He deserved his fate; and Pizarro was perhaps the scourge of God, destined to punish him for his double crimes of usurpation and murder.

Once in the possession of the Spaniards, the fate of Atahualpa was sealed. The short and quick transition which monarchs make from prison to the grave, has passed into a proverb. The conquest of Peru was already in their hands. They had won a mighty empire, without the loss of a single man. History records no similar instance of a bloodless invasion and triumphant victory. For a time the person of the emperor was respected, his commands executed, his desires consulted. They amused him with a promise of liberation, and absolutely induced him to give them no less a sum than three millions and a half in gold, collected from the provinces of his wide dominions, from temples and tombs foully ransacked, from buried and consecrated treasures. But this promise, as may be surmised, was only a feint. No liberation came. A number of mock charges were preferred against the unhappy prisoner—he was tried and found guilty, and sentenced to be burned alive. A commutation of punishment was, however, accorded to him from the stake to the halter, provided he would abjure his idolatry and embrace the faith of Christ. Atahualpa consented. He was executed in Caxamalca publicly, in little more than two months after his splendid entrance into it, the conquering monarch of a vast empire, with fifty thousand soldiers in his camp, and a hundred thousand others scattered over his wide dominions, under the command of brave and experienced generals. He was executed by one hundred and fifty foreigners, the refuse and dregs of the earth, among whom there was not a single man who did not deserve death half-a-dozen times over, if such could be administered, for every species

of crime, from simple larceny up to rapine and assassination, and perhaps worse even still. He was executed like a dog by dogs, in the middle of an empire inhabited by millions, every one of whom would have died in defence of his monarch. Was this destiny, or what was it?

Scarcely had this butchery been completed, when Pizarro was surprised by a visit from a Peruvian noble, who came in great state, attended by a numerous retinue. It was the young prince Manco, brother of the unfortunate Huascar, and the rightful successor to the crown. Being brought before the Spanish commander, he announced his pretensions to the throne, and claimed the protection of the strangers. Motives of policy induced Pizarro to listen to, and accede to his supplications; and he accordingly marched to the capital of the empire, Cuzco, to perform the farce of the coronation,—the new-crowned emperor being in his hands the veriest puppet, and the entire people the most abject slaves.

At this period he founded the city of Lima,—“the fairest gem on the shores of the Pacific;” where he lived the greater part of the rest of his life, and where he died. Needless it were to tell of the constant feuds with the natives and with his own countrymen, in which he was henceforth embroiled,—of the civil wars in which he was engaged with his former friend, lieutenant, and ally,—Almagro; between whom and him there never had been any very cordial understanding, Pizarro always managing to appropriate to himself, greatly to the disgust of his worthy coadjutor, “the lion’s share” both in profit and honours. Numerous and fiery were their altercations. They ended as might be expected. Almagro was taken prisoner, and cruelly and treacherously put to death by Hernando, the brother of Francis Pizarro. The latter might easily have saved his former comrade, but the gratification of his revenge seems to have been like a honey-drop in his mouth all his life, and he moved neither hand nor finger to save the old man, who was strangled in prison. Almagro left a son and a band of faithful followers, who vowed to be revenged on the governor. They conspired to assassinate him. Treachery was in their ranks. The plot was revealed to Pizarro. He disbelieved in and laughed at it, as the dream of a dreamer and fool. The hour of the wicked had come.

"On the day appointed, Rada and his companions met in Almagro's house, and waited with anxiety for the hour when the governor should issue from the church. But great was their consternation when they learned that he was not there, but detained at home, as currently reported, by illness. Little doubting that their design was discovered, they felt their own ruin to be the inevitable consequence, and that too, without enjoying the melancholy consolation of having struck the blow for which they had incurred it. Greatly perplexed, some were for disbanding in the hope that Pizarro might after all be ignorant of their design. But most were for carrying it into execution at once, by assailing him in his own house. The question was summarily decided by one of the party, who felt that in this latter course lay their only chance of safety. Throwing open the doors, he rushed out, calling on his comrades to follow him, or he would proclaim the purpose for which they had met. There was no longer hesitation, and the cavaliers issued forth with Rada at their head, shouting as they went, 'Long live the king! Death to the tyrant!'

"It was the hour of dinner, which in this primitive age of the Spanish colonies was at noon. Yet numbers roused by the cries of the assailants, came out into the square to enquire the cause. 'They are going to kill the Marquess,' some said very coolly: others replied, 'It is Picado,' [The Secretary.] No one stirred in their defence. The power of Pizarro was not seated in the hearts of his people.

"As the conspirators traversed the *plaza*, one of the party made a circuit to avoid a little pool of water that lay in their path. 'What!' exclaimed Rada, 'afraid of wetting your feet, when you are to wade up to your knees in blood!' And he ordered the man to give up the enterprise and go home to his quarters. The anecdote is characteristic.

"The governor's palace stood on the opposite side of the square. It was approached by two court yards. The entrance to the outer one was protected by a massive gate, capable of being made good against a hundred men or more. But it was left open, and the assailants hurrying through to the inner court, still shouting their fearful battle-cry, were met by two domestics loitering in the yard. One of these they struck down. The other flying in all haste towards the house, called out, 'Help, help! the men of Chili are all coming to murder the Marquess.'

"Pizarro at this time was at dinner, or more probably had just dined. He was surrounded by a party of friends, who had dropped in it seems after mass, to enquire after the state of his health, some of whom had remained to partake of his repast. Among these was Don Martinez de Alcantara, Pizarro's half brother by the mother's side, the judge Velasquez, the bishop elect of Quito, and several of the principal cavaliers in the place, to the number of fifteen or twenty. Some of them, alarmed by the uproar in the court yard,

left the saloon, and running down to the first landing on the stair way, enquired into the cause of the disturbance. No sooner were they informed of it by the cries of the servant, than they retreated with precipitation into the house, and as they had no mind to abide the storm unarmed, or at best imperfectly armed, as most of them were, they made their way to a corridor that overlooked the gardens, into which they easily let themselves down without injury. Velasquez the judge, the better to have the use of his hands in the descent, held his rod of office in his mouth : thus taking care, says a caustic old chronicler, not to falsify his assurance that 'no harm should come to Pizarro while the rod of justice was in his hands.'

"Meanwhile the Marquess learning the nature of the tumult, called out to Francisco de Chaves, an officer high in his confidence, and who was in the outer apartment opening on the staircase, to secure the door, while he and his brother Alcantara buckled on their armour. Had his order, coolly given, been as coolly obeyed, it would have saved them all, since the entrance could easily have been maintained against a much larger force, till the report of the cavaliers who had fled had brought support to Pizarro. But unfortunately, Chaves, disobeying his commander, half opened the door, and attempted to enter into a parley with the conspirators. The latter had now reached the head of the stairs, and cut short the debate by running Chaves through the body, and tumbling his corpse down into the area below. For a moment they were kept at bay by the attendants of the slaughtered cavalier; but these too were quickly despatched, and Rada and his companions entering the apartment, hurried across it, shouting out, 'Where is the Marquess? Death to the tyrant.'

"Martinez de Alcantara, who in the adjoining room was assisting his brother to buckle on his mail, no sooner saw that the entrance to the ante-chamber had been gained, than he sprang to the doorway of the apartment, and assisted by two young men, pages of Pizarro, and by one or two cavaliers in attendance, endeavoured to resist the approach of the assailants. A desperate struggle now ensued. Blows were given on both sides, some of which proved fatal, and two of the conspirators were slain, while Alcantara and his brave companions were repeatedly wounded.

"At length Pizarro, unable in the hurry of the moment to adjust the fastenings of his cuirass, threw it away, and enveloping one arm in his cloak, with the other seized his sword, and sprang to his brother's assistance. It was too late, for Alcantara was already staggering under the loss of blood, and soon fell to the ground. Pizarro threw himself on his invaders like a lion roused in his lair, and dealt his blows with as much rapidity and force, as if age had no power to stiffen his limbs. 'What ho!' he cried, 'traitors, have you come to kill me in my own house?' The conspirators drew back for a moment, as two of their body fell under Pizarro's sword; but

they quickly rallied, and from their superior numbers fought at great advantage, by relieving one another in the assault. Still the passage was narrow, and the struggle lasted for some minutes, till both of Pizarro's pages were stretched by his side, when Rada, impatient of the delay, called out, 'Why are we so long about it? Down with the tyrant;' and taking one of his companions, Narvaez, in his arms, he thrust him against the Marquess; Pizarro instantly grappling with his opponent, ran him through with his sword. But at that moment he received a wound in the throat, and reeling he sank on the floor, while the swords of Rada and several of the conspirators were plunged into his body. 'Jesu,' exclaimed the dying man, and tracing a cross with his finger on the bloody floor, he bent down his head to kiss it, when a stroke more friendly than the rest, put an end to his existence."—Vol. ii. pp. 163-168.

This was the end of Pizarro. He fell by the hands of his own countrymen, in his own palace, in the moment of festivity, and of his proudest exaltation. The friends and cavaliers, who feasted at his expense, fled from him without striking a blow in his defence. He perished like a wretched outcast, as he deserved, with none so poor to do him reverence, or over his mangled corpse to say, "God pardon him." Perfidy of the blackest kind, and bravery of the most unreflecting order, were the steps by which he mounted to success. Wherever he went his path was marked with desolation. Fire was not fiercer or more un pitying—the overwhelming ocean might have shown mercy, but Pizarro never did. He found Peru a garden—he converted it into a dreary solitude. He found the people happy, contented, and virtuous—he left them miserable, heart-broken, and vicious. He spared neither sex nor age. He did not reverence gray hairs; he gave his ruffian soldiery unbridled license over young and old, male and female; and we need not ask to be informed what that means, or what awful atrocities were the result. Southey has written his epitaph. It is scarcely severe enough; but the last line is expressive of much.

"Pizarro here was born; a greater name
The list of glory boasts not. Toil and pain,
Famine and hostile elements and hosts
Embattled, failed to check him in his course,
Not to be wearied, not to be deterred,
Not to be overcome. A mighty realm
He overran, and with relentless arm,
Slew or enslaved its unoffending sons,

And wealth, and power, and fame, were his rewards.
There is another world beyond the grave,
According to their deeds where men are judg'd.
O reader! if thy daily bread be earn'd
By daily labour—yea, however low,
However wretched be thy lot assign'd,
Thank thou, with deepest gratitude, the God
Who made thee, that thou art not such as he."

With the death of Pizarro, the history of the Peruvian Conquest may be said to close. With the movements of the conspirators, the proceedings of the young Almagro, the arrival of the new governor, Vacá de Castro; the bloody battle of Chupas, where Almagro and his troops, after performing miracles of valour, were utterly defeated, routed and annihilated; his execution, and that of his followers, we have little interest. Neither is there much to edify the reader in the exploits of his successor, the silly and stupid Blasco Nunez, who seems to have been appointed governor by the court of Spain for the express purpose of *losing* the empire won by so much blood and crime; and who was unanimously deposed after a vice-royalty of a few months, Gonzalo Pizarro being proclaimed, or proclaiming himself—it is hard to say which—governor of Peru. The brilliant episode of this new usurpation is well told by the historian, but it is a mere struggle for power, in which our sympathies are not, and cannot be, awakened for either party—the Peruvians having no interest in it either way—the Spanish court at home, and the miscreant legions of Gonzalo abroad, being the only individuals likely to lose or gain in the struggle. The character and career of Pedro de Gasca, the new viceroy, are well delineated; and this man of gentleness, charity, true religion, and perfect wisdom, contrasts favourably with the horrid vagabonds whose deeds and sayings occupy the entire of the first and the greater portion of the second volume. He arrives in Peru, an humble priest, without sword or soldier, legion or retinue, armed only with his innocence and consummate prudence. The royal commission, entrusting him with a sway almost dictatorial, was never consigned to better hands: nor were greater results ever before won by means so apparently simple. In a few months he broke to pieces the power of Gonzalo, which at one time threatened Spain itself, and this new usurper met the fate that he deserved.

Of the five sons of that renowned military officer, Gonzalo, whose courtship and intrigue with the kitchen-wench of Truxillo we have before mentioned, not one died in his bed. Each and all came to a violent end. Such of them as were not assassinated, were executed; such as were not executed, were stabbed or butchered like dogs or wolves.

Of Almagro and his sons and his friends—nay, of every single man that accompanied Pizarro and his lieutenant on their pillaging, butchering expedition to the shores of Peru, we are warranted in supposing that not a single one died under the roof of a house, or of the usual diseases incident to man. It is almost certain that every individual of them left his carcase on the plains, in the forests, under the rivers, and on the mountains,—a feast for dogs and birds of prey, and fishes. To suppose that any one of them attained a good old age, and died in peace, would be a blasphemy against justice, which even in this life seldom fails to overtake the evil doer, with however tardy a foot she limps upon his track.

Of Spain herself, which sanctioned and reaped the benefit of these monstrous villanies, what need we say, but that she has endured and suffered deserved retribution? The gold which she drew from Peru in annual millions, has melted away, and she is steeped to the lips in utter bankruptcy. The abominations she practised in that unhappy land, were amply revenged by the French under Napoleon on her own sons and daughters. Her commercial character irretrievably ruined, her colonies gone, her power destroyed, her sons armed against each others' lives, her aristocracy the slaves of a foreign minion,—is not the hand of heaven manifest in all these things?

Yet men and nations continue to commit injustice every day, heedless of those dread examples of awful retribution which Heaven hurls in lightning upon the heads of the guilty.

ART. IV.—*Omoo: a Narrative of Adventures in the South Seas.* By HERMAN MELVILLE. London: Murray, 1847.

THIS is the age of puffing and humbug. Huge empty wooden carriages parade the streets of the metropolis, with placards and notices of various inestimable blessings and benefits which certain persons are minded to confer on the enlightened public, if the said public will but "please to buy!" The manifest object of this new system of carrying on business, is to persuade the public that at such and such a locality, teas, and breeches, or hats, as the case may be, are better and cheaper than elsewhere; but the seat of the disease is to be found in the settled determination of the world to buy cheap wares, without any direct reference to the important question of their intrinsic worth—cheap railways carry off all the excursionists, and cheap steam-boats will do the same for your foot-sore clerk, who chuckles at the economy of the "half-penny fares," in utter unconsciousness of the contingent blowing up which he purchases together with his ticket. Regardless of the cost of the material, the every-day working, pushing, go-ahead Englishman *will* now-a-days have a cheap article. The daily press is not exempt from this "low pressure" from without. The last year has witnessed the birth and hitherto successful career of a three-penny morning paper, and we believe that it is perused extensively. Though those who prefer the Daily News to the Times may consider the two-pence "saved" as if they were so many pounds gotten, we very much doubt whether such dealings are calculated substantially to benefit either party, and we deprecate the recourse to prices, which must either leave the speculator in the lurch, or tend to the dissemination of rubbish in the place of sound substantial wares: our strong disinclination to such a state of things arises from the conviction founded on experience, that it leads to humbug and imposition. It is a system resembling a fair in olden times, where he who could bawl out the virtues of his exhibition the loudest, was sure to get all the custom of the country bumpkins and wenches. He who can now advertise his goods in the most outrè guise, or disguise, is now triumphant. The sensual Roman emperor offered a high reward for a new

dish in olden times: modern speculators are more prone to offer rewards for new methods of puffing, where the palate of the public must be tickled and surprised by ingeniously concealed clap-traps. Verily they have their reward too. All the money expended so lavishly by "Moses and Son" on their palace in the Minorities, was "*turned*" by their revolving wax-work figures, which astonished the town not long ago. Aristides was voted a bore, and ostracised accordingly by one man who was tired of hearing him always called "The Just." The citizen of London depends on the contrary principle. The eternal repetition of the tradesman's name, coupled with the merits of his wares, now ensures him the patronage of the cockneys; for, like the farmer, they would believe that the mountebank presented every man with half-a-crown who purchased a seven-and-sixpenny box for 5s., whereas they in fact give 5s. for that which is really worth no more than 2s. 6d. For many months the readers of the advertising columns of every paper in London were astonished at the simple paragraph,

"No. 1., St. Paul's Church-Yard!!"

Some who deemed that those words intimated foregone conclusions, steadily watched the top of Ludgate Hill as they passed the sacred pile, in the hope of witnessing the re-union of the happy pair; others deemed that it was a matrimonial speculation, and that it was an answer to a by-gone and equally mysterious solicitation for an interview. But all were mistaken; and when "All the world and his wife" had noticed and re-noticed "No. 1." daily for nearly six months, it was discovered that an enterprising tea dealer was at the bottom of all the mystery, and "No. 1., St. Paul's Church-Yard," turned out to be Messrs. Daking and Co., who were ready and willing to sell "Rough Congos," "Rare Souchongs," and "High-flavoured Pekoes," at prices "absolutely stunning." So goes the world in many trades; of such given materials are the rounds of the ladder composed by the aid of which that respectability which "keeps a shay" is sought for, and in many cases attained in this 19th century. The means, however, are not to be justified by the mere ends; and we wonder much that so dignified a bibliopole as Mr. Murray could condescend to them. It seems, however, that he must do so as well as his neighbours, or else his

cobwebs will not be adorned with flies. We remember to have seen an advertisement some months ago, which marvellously puzzled us, and certainly reminded us of "No. one, St. Paul's Church-yard"—being nothing more nor less than this, "Omoo, by the author of TYPEE." Our curiosity was excited by this advertisement, which was from time to time repeated, till "Omoo" saw life in the 30th number of "Murray's Home and Colonial Library," when it turned out to be a sequel to a former number, describing the author's experience of life in the Marquesas Islands.

The purpose of the mystic advertisement was accomplished in our case certainly; but we should have much more readily perused *Omoo* if it had been simply announced to the world of Letters as "Adventures in the South Seas," for by that title Mr. Murray now calls it, and we should have had far less repugnance to overcome if we had not been sensible, while we read on and devoured the contents of the volume now before us, page after page, that we, in our critical capacity, had been induced to read the book under a species of false pretence as it were. This sensation has given rise to our atrabilious remarks on the proceedings of the present age—but having given vent to them, we proceed to discuss Mr. Herman Melville "with what appetite we may."

"Truth" has been openly proclaimed to be "stranger than Fiction." Omoo is on that score a truthful book. We would not term it "wonderful," because the qualification of true is generally appended to that adjective by those who intend to signify their want of belief in the fact spoken of. There is, however, one sense in which the term wonderful may be applied to Mr. Melville's production; for we wonder how such a book came to be written by one "before the mast," as he describes himself to be; or how one capable of so thinking, reflecting, recollecting, and inditing, could have gone before the mast! And in a "whaler" too, of all ships in the world! Verily the solution of these "wonders" puzzles us much. Then again, the fact that Mr. Melville "hails from" Yankee Land, (for he dedicates his work "To Herman Gansevoort, of Gansevoort, Saratoga County, New York," with whom he claims consanguinity,) is a circumstance which excites suspicion. Not that we would be supposed to hold the bigoted theory, that every Yankee tale is like

"that 'tarnal sea-sarpint" of which there is neither end nor beginning—as we opine. Far otherwise, but we do mean to say that the "States" are a very large country, and it is very difficult to identify our author by his tone, habits, or thoughts, with any of the peculiar classes into which the land is divided. In the first place, he is to all appearances free from that anti-Anglican prejudice, and those egotistical Americanisms which generally distinguish our good "brother Jonathan," who, though he has somehow or other possessed himself of a tolerable provision for a younger scion of an ancient family, is yet preposterous enough at times to sigh for the family seat which has time out of mind appertained to his elder brother, "John Bull." We next find Mr. Melville indulging in both his works in no very measured comments on the proceedings of the French, both at Nukuheva and Tahiti, so that on the whole we are at fault as to the correctness of his ship's papers, and hardly know whether to trust implicitly to the simple yet insufficient account of himself, which may be gleaned from the prefaces to these works, and from their contents.

Plunging in *medias res*, we are told that our author, having entered the "Dolly," an American sperm whaler, for her voyage to the South Seas, six months had not elapsed before he got heartily sick of the service, and on his arrival at the Marquesas determined to run away. In this he is imitated by one Toby, in the description of whom we may perhaps find the type of our imaginary sailor-author, or perhaps the real actual man himself.

"He was a young fellow about my own age, for whom I had all along entertained a great regard, and Toby, such was the name by which he went among us, for his real name he would never tell us, was every way worthy of it.... Toby, like myself, had evidently moved in a different sphere of life, and his conversation at times betrayed this, although he was anxious to conceal it. He was one of that class of rovers you sometimes meet at sea, who never reveal their origin, never allude to home, and go rambling over the world as if pursued by some mysterious fate they cannot possibly elude."—The Marquesas Islands, p. 33.

This precious pair soon put their plan into execution, and taking flight from the Dolly, betake themselves to the mountains of Nukuheva, in a valley among which reside the "Typees," a savage set of cannibals. The fugitives

soon discovered that in quitting the Dolly they had jumped out of the frying-pan into the fire, and it is very uncertain even now whether Toby was not served up "hot and hot" at some high festival. At all events he disappears most mysteriously from the narrative of the author's adventures in this valley, where, for four months, he was "detained in an indulgent captivity;" at the end of that period he was rescued by the "Julia," an English whaler, the captain of which had put in at the island to obtain hands, and hearing of the captive of Typee, had sent a boat round to his rescue. As soon as our author set his foot on board the Julia, he "signs" for "one voyage," that is, till the arrival of the ship at the next port, when he might leave her if he so pleased. With a captain described as a "young cockney, who a few years ago had emigrated to Australia, and by some favouritism or other had procured the command of the vessel, though he was in no wise competent," and "essentially a landsman, and though a man of education, no more meant for the sea than a hairdresser," it may not be matter of wonder that we should soon be told that the crew of the Julia was in a completely disorganised condition. Sailing out of "Sydney Head," with a ship's company numbering some thirty-two souls, twelve of that complement had deserted in a very short period, while all the remainder were "more or less unwell from a long sojourn in a dissipated port," and under the able superintendence of Jermin, the "bluff mate," had imbibed a strong predilection for an excessive allowance of "Pisco," a cheap substitute for rum. The following description of the mate and the Doctor of the vessel, who figures largely in the whole volume, is good in itself, while it gives an insight into the discipline of a South-Seaman.

"So far as courage, seamanship, and a natural aptitude for keeping riotous spirits in subjection were concerned, no man was better qualified for his vocation than John Jermin. He was the very beau-ideal of the efficient race of short thick-set men. His hair curled in little rings of iron grey all over his round bullet head. As for his countenance, it was strongly marked, deeply pitted with the small-pox. For the rest, there was a fierce little squint out of one eye; the nose had a rakish twist to one side; while his large mouth, and great white teeth, looked absolutely sharkish when he laughed. In a word, no one, after getting a fair look at him, would ever think of improving the shape of his nose, wanting in symmetry if it was. Notwithstanding his vugnacious

looks, however, Jermin had a heart as big as a bullock's; that you saw at a glance.

"Such was our mate; but he had one failing: he abhorred all weak infusions, and cleaved manfully to strong drink. At all times he was more or less under the influence of it. Taken in moderate quantities, I believe, in my soul, it did a man like him good; brightened his eyes, swept the cobwebs out of his brain, and regulated his pulse. But the worst of it was, that sometimes he drank too much, and a more obstreperous fellow than Jermin in his cups, you seldom came across. He was always for having a fight; but the very man he flogged loved him as a brother, for he had such an irresistibly good-natured way of knocking them down, that no one could find it in his heart to bear malice against him. So much for stout little Jermin.

"All English whalemens are bound by law to carry a physician, who, of course, is rated a gentleman, and lives in the cabin, with nothing but his professional duties to attend to; but incidentally he drinks 'flip,' and plays cards with the captain. There was such a worthy aboard of the *Julia*; but, curious to tell, he lived in the fore-castle with the men. And this was the way it happened.

"In the early part of the voyage the doctor and the captain lived together as pleasantly as could be. To say nothing of many a can they drank over the cabin transom, both of them had read books, and one of them had travelled; so their stories never flagged. But once on a time they got into a dispute about politics, and the doctor, moreover, getting into a rage, drove home an argument with his fist, and left the captain on the floor literally silenced. This was carrying it with a high hand; so he was shut up in his state-room for ten days, and left to meditate on bread and water, and the impropriety of flying into a passion. Smarting under his disgrace, he undertook, a short time after his liberation, to leave the vessel clandestinely at one of the islands, but was brought back ignominiously, and again shut up. Being set at large for the second time, he vowed he would not live any longer with the captain, and went forward with his chests among the sailors, where he was received with open arms, as a good fellow and an injured man.

"I must give some further account of him, for he figures largely in the narrative. His early history, like that of many other heroes, was enveloped in the profoundest obscurity; though he threw out hints of a patrimonial estate, a nabob uncle, and an unfortunate affair which sent him a-roving. All that was known, however, was this. He had gone out to Sydney as assistant-surgeon of an emigrant ship. On his arrival there, he went back into the country, and after a few months' wanderings, returned to Sydney penniless, and entered as doctor aboard of the *Julia*.

"His personal appearance was remarkable. He was over six feet high--a tower of bones, with a complexion absolutely colourless,

fair hair, and a light, unscrupulous gray eye, twinkling occasionally with the very devil of mischief. Among the crew, he went by the name of the Long Doctor, or, more frequently still, Doctor Long Ghost. And from whatever high estate Doctor Long Ghost might have fallen, he had certainly at some time or other spent money, drunk Burgundy, and associated with gentlemen.

"As for his learning, he quoted Virgil, and talked of Hobbes of Malmsbury, besides repeating poetry by the canto, especially *Hudibras*. He was, moreover, a man who had seen the world. In the easiest way imaginable, he could refer to an amour he had in Palermo, his lion hunting before breakfast among the Caffres, and the quality of the coffee to be drunk in Muscat; and about these places, and a hundred others, he had more anecdotes than I can tell of. Then such mellow old songs as he sang, in a voice so round and racy, the real juice of sound. How such notes came forth from his lank body was a constant marvel.

"Upon the whole Long Ghost was as entertaining a companion as one could wish; and to me in the *Julia*, an absolute godsend."—pp. 8—10.

Besides these two "stars" was a third in the form of Bembo, "a wild New Zealander, or Mowree," as his countrymen are more commonly called in the Pacific, who was the only "harpooner" left in the ship's company. This worthy spent most of his time out on the bowsprit, fishing for albigores with a bone hook, and occasionally waked all hands up of a dark night, dancing some cannibal fandango all by himself on the forecastle. If the "*Julia's* provisions" were to be taken as an average sample of those laid in by the owners of such crafts, the wonder is, that any man who has once made his escape from one of them, could ever be induced to enter another, even upon the terms stipulated for by "Typee," as the stranger was at first christened by the crew.

"When opened, the barrels of pork looked as if preserved in iron rust, and diffused an odour like a stale ragout. The beef was worse yet; a mahogany-coloured fibrous substance, so tough and tasteless, that I almost believed the cook's story of a horse's hoof with the shoe on having been fished up out of the pickle of one of the casks. Nor was the biscuit much better; nearly all of it was broken into hard little gunflints, honey-combed through and through, as if the worms usually infesting this article in long tropical voyages, had, in boring after nutriment, come out at the antipodes without finding any thing.

"Of what sailors call 'small stores,' we had but little. 'Tea,' however, we had in abundance; though, I dare say, the Hong

merchants never had the shipping of it. Besides this, every other day we had what English seamen call 'shot soup'—great round peas, polishing themselves like pebbles by rolling about in tepid water.

"It was afterwards told me, that all our provisions had been purchased by the owners at an auction sale of condemned navy stores in Sidney."—pp. 11, 12.

With such a captain, crew, and provisions, the "little Jule" was worked by the mate, who alone took observations, kept reckonings, and knew where they were, keeping the men in good humour with plenty of "*Pisco*," and promises of fishing grounds, where the whales were so tame that they made a practice of coming round ships and scratching their backs against them. The death of two men however, and the continued illness of the captain, induced the crew to hold a consultation, and in accordance with the understanding then come to, the mate bore for Papeete, "the village metropolis of Tahiti," where they arrived just in time to hear the *Reine Blanche* fire a salute, which afterwards turned out to be in honour of a treaty, or rather, as far as the natives were concerned, a forced cession of Tahiti to the French, that morning concluded.

The events which preceded and followed this epoch in the history of Tahiti are now too well known to warrant any detailed reference to them in this place, nor do we think that the chapter devoted to the "*Proceedings of the French at Tahiti*," throws much additional light on the subject, and it is not our intention to enter upon that subject; we will, however, insert the following anecdote respecting the wife of Mr. Pritchard, whose name is familiar to our readers.

"The frigate, '(the *Reine Blanche*, bearing the flag of the renowned Admiral Du Petit Thouars),' immediately on arriving to an anchor, got springs on her cables, and with her guns cut loose, and her men at their quarters, lay in the circular basin of Papeete, with her broadside bearing upon the devoted town, while her numerous cutters, hauled in order alongside, were ready to effect a landing, under cover of her batteries. She maintained this belligerent attitude for several days, during which a series of informal negotiations were pending, and wide alarm spread over the island. Many of the Tahitians were at first disposed to resort to arms, and drive the invaders from their shores; but more pacific and feebler counsels ultimately prevailed. The unfortunate queen Pomare, incapable of averting the impending calamity, terrified at the

arrogance of the insolent Frenchman, and driven at last to despair, fled by night in a canoe to Imeeo.

"During the continuance of the panic, in the grounds of the famous missionary consul, Pritchard, then absent in London, the Consular flag of Britain waved as usual during the day, from a lofty staff planted within a few yards of the beach, and in full view of the frigate. One morning an officer, at the head of a party of men, presented himself at the verandah of Mr. Pritchard's house, and inquired in broken English for the lady, his wife. The matron soon made her appearance, and the polite Frenchman, making one of his best bows, and playing gracefully with the aguillettes that danced upon his breast, proceeded in courteous accents to deliver his mission. 'The admiral desired the flag to be hauled down—hoped it would be perfectly agreeable—and his men stood ready to perform the duty.' 'Tell the pirate, your master,' replied the spirited Englishwoman, pointing to the staff, 'that if he wishes to strike those colours, he must come and perform the act himself. I will suffer no one else to do it.' The lady then bowed haughtily, and withdrew into the house. As the discomfited officer slowly walked away, he looked up to the flag, and perceived that the cord by which it was elevated to its place, led from the top of the staff, across the lawn, to an open upper window of the mansion where sat the lady from whom he had just parted, tranquilly engaged in knitting."

As might be expected, the result of this demonstration was, that the flag was undisturbed, for neither the brave admiral, or his representative, M. Bruat, ever after interfered with it while in the keeping of Mrs. Pritchard, though they did pretty much as they liked elsewhere in "Tahiti the beautiful, the queen of the South Seas."

A second disturbance on board the *Julia*, which well nigh ended in mutiny and murder, and a round Robin from the crew, expressive of their determination not to pull another rope on board her, brings on board Mr. Wilson, the representative of Mr. Pritchard, who orders the ring-leaders, including the author and his friend "the Doctor," on board the French frigate, where they witness the "rataning" of two boys, after the Gallican fashion, which our author does not consider as at all so efficient a mode of enforcing naval discipline as the English and American "cat." After a residence of five days on board the French frigate, the whole party were landed and taken before the captain and Mr. Wilson, who, finding them inflexible in their determination, consigns them to the custody of "a fat old native," by whom they are escorted to the build-

ing appointed for refractory sailors, called the "Calabooza Beretanee," or English jail, which, "though extremely romantic in appearance, proved but ill adapted to domestic comfort." This it might well be, seeing that the only piece of furniture was the "stocks," composed of "two stout timbers about twenty feet in length, and precisely alike. One was placed edgeways on the ground, and the other resting on top, left at regular intervals along the beam, several round holes, the object of which was evident at a glance." In this uncomfortable bed the refractory sailors were at first regularly "tucked up" every night by their gaoler, who, however, released them from confinement during the day, and generally employed them in gathering oranges, and in farming occupations. The orderly conduct of the men soon caused a relaxation in the vigilance of their guard, and the time would seem to have passed quickly and pleasantly enough, all things considered, for during the stay of the *Julia*, board as well as lodging was found for the whole party. In about four weeks' time, the captain succeeded in obtaining a new crew, and the author and his companions were virtually set at large, and left to shift for themselves, with a parting legacy from the mate in the shape of their chests, articles which seem to be highly esteemed in those parts.

"The chests themselves were deemed exceedingly precious, especially those with unfractured locks, which would absolutely click, and enable the owner to walk off with the key. Scars, however, and bruises, were considered great blemishes. One old fellow, smitten with the doctor's large mahogany chest (a well filled one, by the by,) and finding infinite satisfaction in merely sitting thereon, was detected in the act of applying a healing ointment to a shocking scratch which impaired the beauty of the lid.

"There is no telling the love of a Tahitian for a sailor's trunk. So ornamental is it held as an article of furniture in his hut, that the women are incessantly tormenting their husbands to bestir themselves, and make them a present of one. When obtained, no pier table just placed in a drawing-room is regarded with half the delight. For these reasons, then, our coming into possession of our estate at this time, was an important event.

"The islanders' are much like the rest of the world; and the news of our good fortune brought us troops of "tayos" or friends, eager to form an alliance after the national custom, and do our slightest bidding.

"The really curious way in which all the Polynesians are in the habit of making bosom friends at the shortest possible notice, is

deserving of remark. Although, among a people like the Tahitians, vitiated as they are by sophisticating influences, this custom has in most cases degenerated into a mere mercenary relation, it nevertheless had its origin in a fine, and in some instances, heroic sentiment, formerly entertained by their fathers."—pp. 153, 154.

The Tahitian tayos seem to be as fleeting in their friendship as were those of the Athenian millionaire. "In the course of a few days, the sailors, like the doctor and myself," says the author, "were cajoled out of every thing, and our tayos all round began to cool off quite sensibly." So remiss did they become in their attentions, that no longer able to rely on their bringing the daily supply of food which all of them had faithfully promised, the crew of the Calabooza set to work to levy contributions on the shipping in the harbour, to which they paid stealthy visits by night in canoes, gathering "unconsidered trifles" in buckets lowered over the vessel's bows, or on the Islanders, whose pigs they slaughtered "*a la discretion*," in all directions.

As might be expected, the sailors soon tired of the shore, especially after they had come into and spent all their fortunes; and an opportunity shortly after offering, the author and his friend, Doctor Long Ghost, betook themselves to the neighbouring island of Imeeo, where, under the names of Peter and Paul, they entered into an arrangement with a worthy pair of planters, named Zeke and Shorty, to serve as labourers for fifteen dollars a month, which, "all but the prospect of digging and delving, suited us exactly." Change however was what was wanted. If not for any other purpose, it was essential to the making up of the author's book, and accordingly on one fine moonlight night, he and his friend embarked on board a canoe, with two other runaway Yankee sailors who had suggested to them the trip, and in a short time landed within the coral reef, which belts that and all the islands of the society group in the valley of Martair.

Here the wanderers are soon treated to a specimen of what was expected of them in return for the hard dollars of their employers, one of whom, Zeke by name, is described as "a tall robust Yankee, born in the backwoods of Maine, sallow, and with a long face;" while the other, Shorty, is a short little Cockney, clipping the aspirates off each word.

"The first day—thank fortune—we did nothing. Having treated us as guests thus far, they no doubt thought it would be wanting in delicacy to set us to work before the compliments of the occasion were well over. The next morning, however, they both looked business-like, and we were put to.

"'Wall, b'ys, (boys) said Zeke, knocking the ashes out of his pipe, after breakfast—we must get at it. Shorty, give Peter there (the doctor) the big hoe, and Paul the other, and let's be off.' Going to a corner, Shorty brought forth three of the implements; and distributing them impartially, trudged on after his partner, who took the lead with something in the shape of an axe.

"For a moment left alone in the house, we looked at each other, quaking. We were each equipped with a great clumsy piece of a tree, armed at one end with a heavy, flat mass of iron.

"The cutlery part—especially adapted to a primitive soil—was an importation from Sydney; the handles must have been of domestic manufacture. 'Hoes'—so called we had heard of, and seen; but they were harmless, in comparison with the tools in our hands.

"'What's to be done with them?' inquired I of Peter.

"'Lift them up and down,' he replied; 'or put them in motion some way or other. Paul, we are in a scrape—but, hark; they are calling;' and shouldering the hoes, off we marched.

"Our destination was the farther side of the plantation, where the ground, cleared in part, had not yet been broken up; but they were now setting about it. Upon halting, I asked why a plough was not used: some of the young wild steers might be caught, and trained for draught.

"Zeke replied, that, for such a purpose, no cattle, to his knowledge, had ever been used in any part of Polynesia. As for the soil of Martair, so obstructed was it with roots, crossing and recrossing each other at all points, that no kind of a plough could be used to advantage. The heavy Sydney hoes were the only thing for such land.

"Our work was now before us; but, previous to commencing operations, I endeavoured to engage the Yankee in a little further friendly chat, concerning the nature of virgin soils in general, and that of the valley of Martair in particular. So masterly a stratagem made Long Ghost brighten up; and he stood by ready to join in. But what our friend had to say about agriculture, all referred to the particular part of his plantation upon which we stood; and having communicated enough on this head, to enable us to set to work to the best advantage, he fell to himself; and Shorty, who had been looking on, followed suit.

"The surface, here and there, presented closely amputated branches of what had once been a dense thicket. They seemed purposely left projecting, as if to furnish a handle, whereby to drag

out the root beneath. After loosening the hard soil, by dint of much thumping and pounding, the Yankee jerked one of the roots this way and that, twisting it round and round, and then tugging at it horizontally.

"'Come! lend us a hand!' he cried, at last; and, running up, we all four strained away in concert. The tough obstacle convulsed the surface with throes and spasms; but stuck fast, notwithstanding.

"'Dumn it!' cried Zeke, 'we'll have to get a rope; run to the house, Shorty, and fetch one.'

"The end of this being attached, we took plenty of room, and strained away once more.

"'Give us a song, Shorty,' said the doctor, who was rather sociable, on a short acquaintance. Where the work to be accomplished is any way difficult, this mode of enlivening toil is quite efficacious among sailors. So, willing to make every thing as cheerful as possible, Shorty struck up, 'Were you ever in Dumbarton?' a marvellously inspiring, but somewhat indecorous windlass chorus.

"At last, the Yankee cast a damper on his enthusiasm, by exclaiming, in a pet, 'Oh! dumn your singing! keep quiet, and pull away!' this we now did, in the most uninteresting silence; until, with a jerk that made every elbow hum, the root dragged out; and, most inelegantly, we all landed upon the ground. The doctor, quite exhausted, stayed there; and, deluded into believing that, after so doughty a performance, we should be allowed a cessation of toil, took off his hat, and fanned himself.

"'Rayther a hard customer, that, Peter,' observed the Yankee, going up to him; 'but it's no use for any on 'em to hang back; for, I'm dummed if they haint got to come out, whether or no. Hurrah! let's get at it agin!'

"'Mercy!' ejaculated the doctor, rising slowly, and turning round. 'He'll be the death of us!'

"Falling to with our hoes again, we worked singly, or together, as occasion required, until 'Nooning Time' came."—pp. 204—207.

This sort of work did not at all chime in with the notions of men who had signed a round-robin, pledging themselves not to pull a rope, and accordingly the doctor feigned sickness. Zeke thereupon proposes a shooting excursion to Typee, and on parting says to his partner, "Shorty, my lad, look arter things, you know; and if you likes, why, there's them roots in the field yonder."

The repetition of such a day's labour proved too much for the perseverance of our friends, who after gently hinting at the subject to their employers, at length abruptly put an end to their contract, and took their departure for

Tamai, an inland village on a lake, the people of which, though "nominally christians," were yet so remote from ecclesiastical jurisdiction, as to revive at times the celebration of their ancient dances and festivals, which it had always been the great aim of the missionaries to abolish. By the connivance of one Rartoo, a hospitable old chief, the adventurers witness a "hevar," a genuine pagan fandango, performed by about twenty girls, who dressed for the occasion in an old bamboo house, with the assistance of some hideous old crones; while Rartoo and the strangers ensconced themselves at a spot whence they could command the theatre on which the ballet was to be performed, a "wide dewy space, lighted up by a full moon, and carpeted with a minute species of fern, growing close together." When we add that it swept right down to the centre of the lake, and that the village lights glistened among the groves on the opposite shores, it may well be conceived that the spectators were no less entranced with the beauty of the scenery, than excited by expectations of the performance they were about to witness in so romantic a theatre.

"We waited impatiently; and at last they came forth. They were arrayed in short tunics of white tappa; with garlands of flowers on their heads. Following them, were the duennas, who remained clustering about the house, while the girls advanced a few paces; and, in an instant, two of them, taller than their companions, were standing side by side, in the middle of a ring, formed by the clasped hands of the rest. This movement was made in perfect silence.

"Presently, the two girls joined hands over head; and, crying out, "Ahloo! ahloo!" waved them to and fro. Upon which, the ring begins to circle slowly; the dancers moving sideways, with their arms a little drooping. Soon they quicken their pace; and, at last, fly round and round; bosoms heaving, hair streaming, flowers dropping, and every sparkling eye encircling in what seemed a line of light.

"Meanwhile, the pair within are passing and repassing each other incessantly. Inclining sideways, so that their long hair falls far over, they glide this way and that; one foot continually in the air, and their fingers thrown forth, and twirling in the moonbeams.

"Ahloo! ahloo!" again cry the dance queens; and, coming together in the middle of the ring, they once more lift up the arch, and stand motionless.

"Ahloo! ahloo!" Every link of the circle is broken; and the girls, deeply breathing, stand perfectly still. They pant hard

and fast, a moment or two; and then, just as the deep flush is dying away from their faces, slowly recede, all round; thus enlarging the ring.

"Again the two leaders waved their hands, when the rest pause; and now, far apart, stand in the still moonlight, like a circle of fairies. Presently raising a strange chant, they softly sway themselves, gradually quickening the movement, until at length, for a few passionate moments, with throbbing bosoms, and glowing cheeks, they abandon themselves to all the spirit of the dance, apparently lost to every thing around. But soon subsiding again into the same languid measure as before, they become motionless; and then, reeling forward on all sides, their eyes swimming in their heads, join in one wild chorus, and sink into each others' arms.

"Such is the Lory-Lory, I think they call it; the dance of the backsliding girls of Tamai.

"While it was going on, we had as much as we could do to keep the doctor from rushing forward and seizing a partuer."—pp. 242, 243.

So delighted was the Doctor with Tamai that he proposed to settle down there, and "Omoo" might never have been written, but that he and his friend were disturbed by the arrival of some strangers, and they returned to Martair for a few days whence they once more, and finally set out on foot for Taloo, "the only frequented harbour of Imceo," on one shore of which lies Partoowye a missionary station, and at that time the permanent residence of the unfortunate queen, in whose service our heroes conceived they might possibly obtain some places of trust and emolument, as many other such adventurers had done in the Pacific, while as a *pis aller* they knew they might at all events procure berths on board a whaler, which was reported to have put in in want of hands and of water.

In order to facilitate their passage through the island, and to obviate their possible apprehension as runaways by the authorities, they procured a sort of passport from Zeke, who, after some violent literary throes bespeaking the nature of the composition, produced the desired document which he declined to date, observing, that, "In this here dummed climate a fellow can't keep the run of the months, no how; cause there's no seasons; no summer, no winter to go by; one's eternally thinking its always July, its so pesky hot."

Armed with this talisman they commenced their jour-

ney, but how they fared on the broken coral beach, and how they were received by the bewitching damsels, and entertained by old Marharvai at Loohooloo, we must not stop now to narrate. Suffice it to say that they arrived in safety at Partoowye, where we are introduced to a distinguished elder of the church, the only real christian, with the exception of Arfretee his lady, whom the author met with in either of the Islands, who delighted in the euphonious appellation of Ereemear Po-Po, which being rendered into English, means "Jeremiah-in-the-Dark." Unconscious that there is nothing in a name, the missionaries seem to exercise a salutary control over the titles which their converts shall receive at the font, rejecting some of the significant names which they have received from their native godpapas, and godmammas, and substituting in their place some scripture name. It so happened that Jeremiah was originally called "Narmo-Nana Po-Po," or the "Darer-of-Devils-by-night." And having selected Ereemear from a long list of names more pleasing to the ear of the missionary, he ultimately became a christian under an appellation which might be rendered, "Jeremiah-in-the-Dark." The description of this man's establishment as well as a scene in the court house, where a case of delicate interest was inquired into by the native authorities, will amply repay perusal. Indeed, throughout the whole book there runs a vein of humour and irony, combined with great powers of observation and expression which renders it highly interesting, and we may say engrossing. Our interest in it has almost led us into a forgetfulness of the limits imposed upon our observations, but as a work on Tahiti without reference to poor Pomaree, or the social condition of the inhabitants, would be like playing Timour the Tartar without horses; we feel that we are justified, after saying that our author vanishes as he appeared in a whaler, in giving the following extract concerning the "presentation at court" from which our friend had drawn such magnificent visions.

"In answer to our earnest requests to see the queen, we were now conducted to an edifice, by far the most spacious, in the inclosure. It was at least one hundred and fifty feet in length, very wide, with low eaves, and an exceedingly steep roof of pandannas leaves. There were neither doors nor windows—nothing along the sides but the slight posts supporting the rafters. Between these posts, curtains of fine matting and tappa were

rustling all round ; some of them were festooned, or partly withdrawn, so as to admit light and air, and afford a glimpse now and then of what was going on within.

"Pushing aside one of the screens, we entered. The apartment was one immense hall ; the long and lofty ridge-pole fluttering with fringed matten and tassels, full forty feet from the ground. Lounges of mats, piled one upon another, extended on either side ; while here and there were slight screens, forming as many recesses, where groups of natives—all females—were reclining at their evening meal.

"As we advanced, these various parties ceased their buzzing, and in explanation of our appearance among them, listened to a few cabalistic words from our guide.

"The whole scene was a strange one ; but what most excited our surprise, was the incongruous assemblage of the most costly objects from all quarters of the globe. Cheek by jowl, they lay beside the rudest native articles, without the slightest attempt at order. Superb writing-desks of rosewood, inlaid with silver and mother-of-pearl ; decanters and goblets of cut glass ; embossed volumes of plates ; gilded candelabras ; sets of globes and mathematical instruments ; the finest porcelain ; richly mounted sabres and fowling-pieces ; laced hats and sumptuous garments of all sorts, with numerous other matters of European manufacture, were strewn about among greasy calabashes half-filled with '*poe*,' rolls of old tappa and matting, paddles and fish-spears, and the ordinary furniture of a Tahitian dwelling.

"All the articles first mentioned were, doubtless, presents from foreign powers. They were more or less injured : the fowling-pieces and swords were rusted ; the finest woods were scratched ; and a folio volume of Hogarth lay open, with a cocoanut shell of some musty preparation capsized among the miscellaneous furniture of the Rake's apartment, where that inconsiderate young gentleman is being measured for a coat.

"While we were amusing ourselves in this museum of curiosities, our conductor plucked us by the sleeve, and whispered, '*Pomaree ! Pomaree ! aramai kow kow.*'

"'*She is coming to sup, then,*' said the doctor, staring in the direction indicated. '*What say you, Paul, suppose we step up.*' Just then a curtain near by, lifted ; and from a private building a few yards distant, the queen entered, unattended.

"*She wore a loose gown of blue silk, with two rich shawls, one red and the other yellow, tied about her neck. Her royal majesty was barefooted.*

"*She was about the ordinary size, rather matronly ; her features not very handsome ; her mouth, voluptuous ; but there was a care-worn expression in her face, probably attributable to her late misfortunes. From her appearance, one would judge her about forty ; but she is not so old.*

"As the queen approached one of the recesses, her attendants hurried up, escorted her in, and smoothed the mats on which she at last reclined. Two girls soon appeared, carrying their mistress's repast; and then, surrounded by cut glass and porcelain, and jars of sweetmeats and confections, Pomaree Vahinee I., the titular Queen of Tahiti, ate fish and pœe out of her native calabashes, disdaining either knife or spoon.

"'Come on,' whispered Long Ghost, 'let's have an audience at once;' and he was on the point of introducing himself, when our guide, quite alarmed, held him back, and implored silence. The other natives also interfered; and as he was pressing forward, raised such an outcry that Pomaree lifted her eyes, and saw us for the first.

"She seemed surprised, and offended; and issuing an order in a commanding tone to several of her women, waved us out of the house. Summary as the dismissal was, court etiquette, no doubt, required our compliance. We withdrew; making a profound inclination as we disappeared behind the tappa arras."—pp. 314—316.

This reception being wisely deemed decisive of their hopes at court, our author negotiated for a berth with the captain of the *Leviathan* for himself and his friend. The captain, however, a Yankee, put down the Doctor as a "bird from Sydney," and would have nothing to say to him, notwithstanding the most pressing solicitation; and after a few hours of preparation the good ship sailed with our author, who, for aught we know, may next turn up at the North Pole, and amuse the world and ourselves with adventures among the Esquimaux. Perchance he may be the identical man who has exhibited Tom Thumb, or the Bosjemans from Caffraria. If the latter, we confess we should have preferred his experience in the shape of another book, for it is clear that he has the power and inclination of rendering his adventures palatable to the most fastidious readers, though he must have waded through a great deal of rubbish and dirt while engaged in culling the sweets with which he has delectated our senses. Judging from what he says, and perhaps even from what he does not say, in which latter judgment all critics are far more far-sighted than in the former, it is to be lamented that, like all his predecessors, Mr. Melville has come to the conclusion, that European intercourse has not benefitted the simple savages of those groups which stud the Pacific. In the times of Cook and Vaucomer their happy Islands swarmed with a busy, active, and, for the most part,

enlightened community. Simplicity and faith were their characteristics, while Paganism asserted her sway over their minds. But what do we find them now to be? Depopulated to an incredible extent, (Tahiti now numbers only nine thousand souls, whereas Captain Cook estimated them at 200,000,) the Tahitians have lost the trade and manufacture for which they were noted at the period of their discovery. Astonished at the superiority of the productions introduced by the great navigator and those who have followed him, the natives have abandoned the building of canoes, the manufacture of tappa, and lead, according to the testimony of all voyagers, a "nerveless, aimless life." This absence of perseverance in labour, coupled with the fearful ravages of disease, and all the evil consequences of commerce with abandoned sailors and "birds from Sydney," must sooner or later, and at no very distant period, reduce them to a mere fragment of a nation. Thus will the great principle be maintained which seems to be ever at work where "nature unadorned," and so-called "European civilization" conflict. The former must and will give way before the latter, whose very faults and vices aid its virtues in the crusade against the red man. Drink and immorality have done their work handsomely on all such occasions, and have proved themselves to be quite as effective handmaids as the sword and the cannon in thinning the ranks of naked savages; and, despite the labours of the missionary, Tahiti seems to have deteriorated as much under the blight of civilization as any other island. Much no doubt of the mischief was accomplished before the mission was established on its shores, now some sixty years ago—but the laws which now prevail have sprung from the missionaries, and we confess that we cannot go along with the reverend lawmakers when they crusade against "short kilts" as indecorous, and forbid necklaces and garlands among the women, and interdict the men from "wrestling, foot-racing, throwing the javelin, and archery," and such like athletic games, while they introduce nothing but psalm-singing and religious observances in their stead. The result has been, we are told by Mr. Melville, confirmed by Captain Barclay, Kotzebue, Dr. Russell, and Daniel Wheeler, "an honest-hearted Quaker," far from satisfactory, though idolatry has been abolished, and the translation of the Bible into the language of the Island has been accomplished. We would not

willingly be taken to undervalue or scoff at these points, or to wish undone all that has been done by the missionaries in these doomed communities. Far from it; we are satisfied that the labourers in these vineyards are for the most part active, zealous, and sincere Christians; and that they have to some extent arrested evil, if they have not advanced good; but taking our author's experience of the valley of Typee, where the cross has not been planted, and indeed where the sands of the sea-shore are as unconscious of European impressions, as the minds of the natives are of any religion or civilization but that which they inherited with those sands from their ancestors, and his observations on the social condition of the Tahitians, we must say that we rise from the subject with doubt, if not with dismay—all-powerful as the sacred cause is which the missionaries advocate, it is impotent before the evils which accompany, or we should in justice say, precede it.

Before the cross can be planted, godless enterprise and gold seeking commerce mark these native simpletons for their own—and few, few indeed we suspect are the instances in which the traveller in Polynesia will find a household so godly in the nineteenth century as that of Po-Po. For the most part the converts are a very different set of people, and practise, our author assures us, “the grossest hypocrisy in matters of religion,” which he attributes to a jealous, and in many cases a coercive superintendence over their spiritual well being, “on the part of the missionaries, who,” on Sunday mornings, when the prospect is rather small for a full house in the minor churches, send out “a parcel of fellows with ratans into the big houses and by-ways as whippers in of the congregation.”

“These worthies constitute a sort of religious police.....on week days they are quite as busy as on Sundays, to the great terror of the inhabitants, going all over the island, and spying out the wickedness thereof. Moreover they are the collectors of fines, levied generally in grass mats, for obstinate non-attendance upon divine worship, and other offences amenable to the ecclesiastical judicature of the missionaries.”

* Such being the mode in which the outward observance of religion is enforced, hypocrisy necessarily follows in public, and unless the congregation fares well when in obedience to such *pressing arguments* they obey the sound of the church bell, we fear that it will prevail in private also.

Let us then endeavour to ascertain what sort of spiritual food is presented to them. Certainly, if Mr. Melville's interpreter is to be trusted, the provisions of the pulpit are scarcely superior to those of the Dolly or Julia. Speaking of the Cathedral of Papoar, he says,

"The place is well filled. Every where meet the eye the gay calico draperies worn on great occasions by the higher classes, and forming a strange contrast of patterns and colours. In some instances, these are so fashioned as to resemble as much as possible European garments. This is an excessively bad taste. Coats and pantaloons, too, are here and there seen ; but they look awkwardly enough, and take away from the general effect.

"But it is the array of countenances that most strikes you. Each is suffused with the peculiar animation of the Polynesians, when thus collected in large numbers. Every robe is rustling, every limb in motion, and an incessant buzzing going on throughout the assembly. The tumult is so great, that the voice of the placid old missionary, who now rises, is almost inaudible. Some degree of silence is at length obtained through the exertions of half-a-dozen strapping fellows, in white shirts and no pantaloons. Running in among the settees, they are at great pains to inculcate the impropriety of making a noise, by creating a most unnecessary racket themselves. This part of the service was quite comical."—169—170.

So much for the behaviour of the congregation, now for the sermon.

"Having been informed, from various sources, that the discourses of the missionaries, being calculated to engage the attention of their simple auditors, were, naturally enough, of a rather amusing description to strangers ; in short, that they had much to say about steam boats, lord mayors' coaches, and the way fires are put out in London, I had taken care to provide myself with a good interpreter, in the person of an intelligent Hawaiian sailor, whose acquaintance I had made.

"'Now, Jack,' said I, before entering, 'hear every word, and tell me what you can, as the missionary goes on.'

"Jack's was not, perhaps, a critical version of the discourse ; and, at the time, I took no notes of what he said. Nevertheless, I will here venture to give what I remember of it ; and, as far as possible, in Jack's phraseology, so as to lose nothing by a double translation.

"'Good friends, I glad to see you ; and I very well like to have some talk with you to-day. Good friends, very bad times in Tahiti ; it make me weep. Pomaree is gone—the island no more

yours, but the Wee-Wee's (French). Wicked priests here, too ; and wicked idols in woman's clothes, and brass chains.*

“ ‘ Good friends, no you speak, or look at them—but I know you won't—they belong to a set of robbers—the wicked Wee-Wees. Soon these bad men be made to go very quick. Beretanee ships of thunder come, and away they go. But no more 'bout this now. I speak more by by.

“ ‘ Good friends, many whale-ships here now ; and many bad men come in 'em. No good sailors living—that you know very well. They come here, 'cause so bad they no keep 'em home.

“ ‘ My good little girls, no run after sailors—no go where they go ; they harm you. Where they come from no good people talk to 'em—just like dogs. Here, they talk to Pomaree, and drink *arva* with great Poofai.†

“ ‘ Good friends, this very small island, but very wicked, and very poor ; these two go together. Why Beretanee so great ? Because that island good island,‡ and send *mickonaree*§ to poor *kannaka*.§ In Beretanee, every man rich : plenty things to buy ; and plenty things to sell. Houses bigger than Pomaree's, and more grand. Every body, too, ride about in coaches, bigger than hers,|| and wear fine tappa every day. (Several luxurious appliances of civilization were here enumerated, and described.)

“ ‘ Good friends, little to eat left at my house. Schooner from Sydney no bring bag of flour ; and kannaka no bring pig and fruit enough. Mickonaree do great deal for kannaka ; kannaka do little for mickonaree. So, good friends, weave plenty of cocoa-nut baskets, fill 'em, and bring 'em to-morrow.

“ ‘ Such was the substance of great part of this discourse ; and, whatever may be thought of it, it was specially adaped to the minds of the islanders ; who are susceptible to no impressions, except from things palpable, or novel and striking. To them, a dry sermon would be dry indeed.

* “ Meaning the showy image of the Virgin in the little Catholic chapel.”

† “ The word ‘ *arva*,’ as here employed, means brandy. Poofai, was one of the highest chiefs on the island, and a jolly companion.”

‡ “ This word, evidently a corruption of ‘ missionary,’ is used under various significations by the natives. Sometimes, it is applied to a communicant of the Church. But above, it has its original meaning,”

§ “ A word generally used by foreigners to designate the natives of Polynesia.”

|| “ Pomaree, some time previous, had received a present of a chariot from Queen Victoria. It was afterwards sent to Oahu (Sandwich Islands), and there sold to pay her debts.”

"The Tahitians can hardly ever be said to reflect: they are all impulse; and so, instead of expounding dogmas, the missionaries give them the large type, pleasing cuts, and short and easy lessons of the primer. Hence, any thing like a permanent religious impression is seldom or ever produced."—pp. 171—173.

Ludicrous as this may seem, we fear that there must be some truth in the version, and that little or no benefit can be reaped from the exertions of the missionaries while they are backed by such arguments, and confronted by the seductions of all those vices which have already exercised so malignant an influence over the hapless Polynesians. Indeed, they are a devoted race, and are represented as mournfully watching over their doom. The greeting of Pomaree II. to some of the earliest missionaries sufficiently marks the condition of this interesting race at that time. "You have come," said the monarch, "to see me at a very bad time. Your ancestors came in the time of men, when Tahiti was inhabited. You are come to behold just the remnant of my people." And doubtless he remembered the prediction of Tecarmoar the high priest of Parree, uttered one hundred years before, which down to the present time is often lowly and sadly chaunted by the aged Tahitians as they recall the deeds of their youth, and re-enact the glories of their ancient kingdom.

"A harree ta fow
A toro ta farraro
A now ta tararta."

"The palm tree shall grow,
The coral shall spread,
But man shall cease."

With this extract we must be content, *nolentes volentes*, to take our leave of Mr. Melville's most interesting and romantic "Adventures." Whether the doubts which have insinuated themselves into our mind touching the degree of credit to which they are entitled may appear to others to be well founded or no, is a question which all his readers must decide for themselves. For our own parts, we can only say, as did the "Sapient Grizzle," when called on to give his opinion of the feats attributed to General Tom Thumb,—

"I tell you, Madam, it was all a trick:
He made the giants first, and then he kill'd them."

ART. V.—*A Manual of British and Irish History; Illustrated with Maps, Engravings, and Statistical, Chronological, and Genealogical Tables.* By the REV. THOMAS FLANAGAN, Professor at St. Mary's College, Oscott. 8vo., London, Jones, 1847.

A FEW such volumes as this will go far to realize our idea of a popular Catholic literature. To those who know the numberless compendiums in every department of science, with which, under the technical name of "Hand-books," the foreign literature, and especially the German, abounds, it has long been a matter of surprise that the system of condensing and popularizing knowledge in which these compendiums originated, is finding its way so slowly among us. Although often far from immaculate in their principles, and, in other respects, imperfect and unsatisfactory, yet there is in the German Hand-books, notwithstanding, a great deal which it would be our interest to imitate, and from which we might usefully learn. They are, generally speaking, solid, erudite, and well arranged. If their principles are, as not unfrequently occurs, bad and objectionable, their learning is commonly beyond reproof; and as mere indexes of the subject which they treat, and books of reference to the original sources of information, they are often, even the very worst of them, invaluable to a student who would investigate for himself.

The nearest approach to the German "Hand-book" which we are able to boast in the more ordinary departments, is found in the compendiums for the use of schools, of which, as far as number goes, there is no lack in England. But they are very different in their character; and, especially for advanced students, their plan is far from being equally satisfactory. Without any pretension to learning whatever, they possess, ordinarily speaking, no evidence of authority for the student beyond that of the compiler himself; and if the pupil should desire further information on any obscure or doubtful or unsatisfactory statement, he is utterly without guide as to the sources to which he may usefully refer.

We need scarcely observe that there is no department to which these remarks apply with more truth than that of history; and the difficulties by which students, and especially Catholic students, found themselves beset in the

study of English history, are detailed with great modesty, but yet with great clearness, by the author of the admirable "Manual," now before us. Many of the compendiums, (which, for the most part, are but different modifications of Goldsmith,) besides being exceedingly meagre and defective, were so filled with prejudice, and so distorted in their views, that no Catholic could venture to use them, if he wished to preserve, we will not say his principles, but even his temper. And although more than one effort had been made of later years to compile treatises suited to the use of Catholic children, yet it cannot be denied that, while they undoubtedly tended to clear the subject from most of the prejudices by which it had been overlaid, yet they shared the other defect to which we have alluded, being meagre and imperfect, and overlooking altogether many of the most interesting and important facts and views which the researches of modern historians have brought to light.

Under these circumstances it is hardly necessary for us to repeat the opinion which we have already briefly expressed, and to declare our sense of the obligation which the Catholic public, and especially its younger members, owe to the author of the excellent "Manual of British and Irish History." It is precisely the sort of work which the exigencies of the case required—at once solid and attractive—replete with most valuable information, yet, in deference to younger readers, not overloaded with what is popularly called erudition. There is nothing of interest or importance, even in the most recent of the historians, to which the writer will not be found to have given its full weight, and yet he has had the good sense to avoid all that parade of discussion, into which one who had not fully understood the nature and object of the work which he had undertaken would, almost of necessity, have been betrayed. In truth, he has succeeded in compiling that most difficult, and yet most invaluable of all treatises, a complete "Hand-book of English and Irish History," in the very best sense of the word.

But while we freely acknowledge the judiciousness of the author's plan, as regards younger students, there is one particular in which we could wish that he had followed more closely the German originals to which we have been referring. His facts, as we have taken pains to satisfy ourselves by several examples which may be fairly assumed

as tests, are most carefully ascertained, and his statements verified by most scrupulous research; but he has omitted to append the authorities by which they are substantiated; and although for the uses to which it is destined, that of a text-book for schools, and a manual for popular study, the omission is not of great moment, yet in a work so valuable, and which might with so much justice aspire to a higher destiny, we cannot help regarding it as unfortunate. It is true that the introduction of such authorities often has the effect of embarrassing and confusing the pupil, and would have had the further disadvantage of swelling, to an enormously inconvenient bulk, a volume already perhaps too much over-grown; but these disadvantages would have been more than counterbalanced by its increased utility to the more advanced student, and, in general, to all readers of the educated class. From the abundant evidences of care, however, which his statements uniformly evince, as well as from the excellent preliminary dissertation on the literature of English History, we have no doubt that the author has his authorities still ready at his hand; and we trust that in his next edition, he will recognize the expediency of appending them, at least on all the more important controversies.

After all, however, that want which the author undertook to supply was that of a history for educational purposes; and in this he has succeeded to the fullest extent of our wishes or anticipations. His qualifications as a historian had already been tested on many occasions in the pages of this journal; and in the work before us he has shown himself as capable of grasping the broad outlines, and of dealing with the general bearings of history, as he had before displayed his fitness for the nicer and more minute discussions which it involves. His style is clear, simple, natural, and energetic; his arrangement of facts is orderly and judicious; his narrative is graceful and vigorous; his descriptions are graphic and concise; and his sketches of character, without being elaborate, are bold and striking, and at the same time, calm, judicious, and well-considered.

Nor has he confined himself to a dry detail of the facts. His volume will be found to embody, interwoven with great taste and judgment, a large amount of information on the arts, the literature, the manners, and the usages of the several periods which it comprises. The political and constitutional history, too, are carefully and minutely traced;

and all these subjects are gracefully illustrated, not only from the writers who have treated them in detail, but also from the contemporary historians, poets, and ecclesiastical writers. For a young student this information, communicated in a manner so easy and intelligible, is of the utmost importance; and when it is added, that the manners, the costume, the architecture, the arts, &c., of each period are illustrated by a large series of wood-engravings interspersed throughout the work, some idea may be formed of its value for the purposes of education.

We have taken pains to examine its opinions on the most important historical controversies which have been raised by the English historians. It would be tedious to enter into an enumeration of them here. But we must say that, in most of these cases, it is impossible to lay down Mr. Flanagan's Manual without feeling that he has considered them carefully, and never chosen his own views without full knowledge of the evidence on which it rests. It would be easy to show this by a reference to a few examples. But such discussions are necessarily tedious and uninteresting; and we shall consult better for our reader's taste, by submitting a few specimens of the author's general style and manner.

We open almost at random the account of the murder of Rizzio. It will be seen that, though there is no parade of criticism or discussion, the author has availed himself of the results of all the recent historical researches.

"A little before the late insurrection, Mary had, first privately and afterwards publicly, married Darnley. She soon discovered that her partner was violent, implacable, and given to intoxication. In his fits of drunkenness he forgot even the public respect which he owed to the queen. His unrestrained passions soon plunged him into that career which speedily cut short his life. Mary having summoned a parliament, both to attain the most guilty of the late conspirators, and to insure liberty of conscience to the Catholics, Darnley demanded the punishment of the duke of Chastelherault, and a matrimonial crown for himself. By the first measure the house of Hamilton would forfeit its right of succession to the crown, and by the latter, Darnley would retain for life the Scottish crown, although he had already given proof of his utter incapacity. Mary, therefore, firmly refused her acquiescence. As David Rizzio, the queen's secretary, sometimes incorrectly styled her musician, had always taken her part against her brutal husband, Darnley attributed the present refusal to his advice.

"There were then at court several lords who had been implicated, though not by any public acts, in the late rebellion. By fomenting

Darnley's rage against Rizzio, these men hoped not only to escape the consequences of their treason, but, at the same time, to assist their fellow-traitors that were already in exile. They told Darnley that Rizzio was more the favourite of Mary than himself; that Rizzio had advised Mary's late refusal; and that there was no remedy, unless Darnley would call in the assistance of the exiled lords. Darnley suffered himself to become the dupe of the plot. He entered into a formal bond for the return of Murray and other exiles, for the overthrow of Mary's government, and for the murder of several of his fancied enemies; and it was determined to begin with Rizzio. The conspirators were Morton, Lindsey, Ruthven, Knox, and other leading men of the Kirk. They raised the old cry of the "Evangil in danger," spread a report that Rizzio was agent of the pope, and that Mary had formed a holy league for the extermination of the Protestants. A fast was proclaimed from one Sunday to the Sunday after, and during the intermediate week, the audience were excited by the reading of those portions of Scripture that described the extirpation of idolatry, and God's punishment of wicked princes, and of those that refused to listen to the voice of his prophets.

"On the Saturday evening of the fast, Mary was taking supper with two of her relations; Rizzio was in waiting, attired in the full evening court-dress of the period, and the captain of the guard and the master of the household were likewise in attendance. Suddenly, Darnley entered by a private door. Scarcely had he taken his place beside the queen, when a confused noise and heavy steps were heard on the staircase by which Darnley had entered, and Ruthven, in complete armour, followed by four other conspirators, entered the queen's presence. Mary ordered Ruthven to quit the room, under penalty of treason. Unsheathing his dirk, he replied, that his errand was with Rizzio. Shrieking for justice, the latter took shelter behind the queen, while the conspirators, overturning the table on their way, rushed forward to dispatch him. Mary's voice was scarcely heard in the confusion, and her gestures were equally disregarded. One brandished his dagger at her throat, two others held their pistols to her face, while Douglas snatched the king's dirk from his belt, and, aiming over the queen's shoulder, stabbed Rizzio in the back. The next moment, they had seized their victim, and, dragging him to the door of the adjoining room, dispatched him with fifty-six wounds (March 9, A.D. 1566). All this time Morton and Lindsey and a body of armed men kept the great gate. The alarm-bell, however, rang, and the citizens of Edinburgh flew to arms, and thronged to the palace. They were told, that if they attempted a rescue, the queen should be "cut in collops and thrown over the wall;" and shortly the king showed himself, and at his command the citizens withdrew. All that night and the following day, the queen was in the hands of the conspirators, expecting death. Their demand that she should ratify their doings, and establish the Reformation, by no means allayed her fears. The following night, as Darnley promised to keep the queen in safe custody, the conspirators withdrew.

Darnley, however, became ashamed of his conduct, and was soon induced to escape with Mary to Dunbar. Elizabeth was aware of the conspiracy, and made no effort to put Mary on her guard. She indeed ordered the assassins to quit England, but the messengers were instructed to add that the country was 'long and broad,' and that they had nothing to fear, unless they thrust themselves upon the notice of the public.

"Darnley's share in the murder of Rizzio, despite of his repentance, had now rendered him an object of tormenting suspicion to Mary, and of scorn and aversion to the whole nation. His imprudence increased the number of his enemies: an attempt to remove Maitland from the post of secretary enkindled a desire for revenge in that treacherous statesman, and a passionate threat to take the life of Murray drew upon him the redoubled hatred of that crafty nobleman. That Murray was the originator of the plot that followed, there is little room to doubt. Self-interest arrayed all those in his cause, who had received grants of crown-lands from the extravagant liberality of Mary: for it was well known that such grants had no force in law, being liable to be revoked at any time before the queen attained the age of twenty-five. Some, indeed, she had already resumed, and Darnley had urged her to a general resumption."—pp. 483-485.

It may not be uninteresting to give a specimen of the author's manner of dealing with Irish subjects. We select as an example his summary history of Strafford's government in Ireland.

"To understand the nature of the tidings from Ireland, it will be necessary to revert to the administration of Strafford, then Viscount Wentworth, in that country, in the earlier part of the reign of Charles. In order to obtain a supply of one hundred and twenty thousand pounds from the Irish Catholics, Charles had promised to grant them permission to practice in courts of law, as well as legal titles to their lands, and many other "*graces*;" and these graces were to be confirmed in the next parliament (A.D. 1628). Before this parliament had assembled, Wentworth arrived as lord-deputy. He surrounded himself with guards, and with all the ceremonial of the royal court; and having tampered, in the most arbitrary manner, with the elections, opened the parliament. His precautions, and the hopes of the members that the graces would be ratified, procured him six subsidies. Nor were these subsidies the uncertain revenue hitherto levied, of one mark per annum for ten years on every manured plough-land; but, by a total change of system, an introduction of the English subsidy of four shillings in the pound on land, and two and eight-pence on goods, and which in Ireland produced forty thousand pounds. This, however, did not include the subsidy of the lords, which amounted to six thousand pounds, and was a rate of four per cent. upon their rents. Notwithstanding the liberality of this grant, the Catholics obtained but few of the promised graces: the promise, it was said, had been given inconsiderately (A.D. 1634)!

"The lord-deputy's next measure was to unite the churches of England and Ireland. He was vigorously but fruitlessly opposed by the convocation. The new code of discipline was drawn up, first, by a committee of divines, then by Usher, the Protestant bishop of Armagh; and, neither of these being approved of, was at last confirmed by the deputy himself, who required the names of all that should refuse to subscribe to the instrument. Only one had the courage to brave the deputy's wrath. 'Now,' exclaimed Wentworth, 'I can say that the king is as absolute here, as any prince in the whole world can be.'

"Triumphant in parliament and convocation, the deputy now directed all his means of oppression to the subversion of Catholicity. His plan was, to erect a court of wards, by which the children of Catholics were to be brought up among Protestant strangers; and to withhold from persons thus brought up the titles to their inheritance, until they had taken the oath of supremacy. To elude the claim to wardship, the Catholics had recourse to the same distinction between use and possession, which had become legalized in England. This distinction was obliterated by a new statute, and the Catholics had no longer a shelter from the operation of the royal claim to wardship. It is to this tyrannical measure that we must attribute the Protestantism of some of the Irish gentry and nobility. The earl of Ormond was one of the first of these unconscious victims, 'who,' observed Wentworth himself, 'if bred under the wings of his own parents, had been of the same affections and religion his brothers and sisters are.'

"If the landed proprietors were thus converted into Protestants, Wentworth trusted that there would be little comparative difficulty with their tenants, and the lower classes in general. It would, however, greatly forward his design, if he were to locate a body of English Protestants upon the estates of the Catholics. For this purpose, as well as to secure a large revenue, he claimed nearly all the lands of Connaught for the crown. They had, he maintained, been granted by Henry III. to Richard de Burgo, except five cantreds which had been reserved by the crown. Now as Charles was the heir both of Henry and de Burgo, all the lands in question were, rightfully, his. The amazement of the Connaught proprietors at such an announcement, may well be imagined. Nor was the claim confined to words. Surrounded with soldiers, Wentworth proceeded from place to place, holding juries of freeholders, and compelling them, by threats, to return a verdict in favour of the crown. Those in Galway, however, were not so easily to be intimidated: they found a verdict, not for the crown, but for the freeholders. Their courageous justice was punished with heavy fines and severe compositions. Yet the plan of stripping them of half their lands was not allowed to be fully executed; the voice of the oppressed had appealed from the king to heaven, and the appeal, it would seem, was not unheard: their oppressor returned to England (A.D. 1635), and we have seen the retribution which there awaited him."—577-578.

We subjoin one other extract from that portion of the

work which may properly be called antiquarian—an account of the English army in the time of Edward III.

"There were four classes of soldiers in the army, men-at-arms, hoblers, archers, and billmen. Under the term *men-at-arms*, were included, not only knights and esquires, but their heavy-armed followers, who now, for the first time, became a part of the feudal cavalry. They were all in complete armour, and bore a shield and sword, a lance twelve or fifteen feet long, and a battle-axe or mace. On a march, the heavy cavalry, if attacked, might easily be overpowered; for, on such occasions, the knights seldom wore the heavier part of their armour, and usually rode a hack, while the war-horse was led by a mounted esquire.

"The poorest class of knights were termed knights-bachelors, a corruption of '*bas chevalier*,' and were allowed to display a long pennon terminating in a point. As every knight could confer knighthood at pleasure upon those whose bravery seemed to deserve it, the knights-bachelors became a very numerous body. Possessing little or no landed property, these men depended upon the bounty, or *largesse* of the princes whom they served, or upon the ransom of the nobler captives that became their prey: and hence it was that they formed the bravest part of the mercenary troops. To make their fortune was their chief object; and, therefore, they seldom restrained their freebooting propensities, as long as the acquisition of plunder was unaccompanied with the disgrace of directly infringing the statutes of knighthood.

"Every knight was accompanied by at least one page and one esquire, who were themselves candidates for knighthood. Those that had not only these attendants, but vassal-knights in their train, were allowed to unfurl a square-banner, and assume the title and dignity of knights bannerets. No man, though earl or prince, could display either pennon or banner, or receive the honours of knighthood, unless he had passed through the usual gradations and the usual ceremonies. Royalty itself could not enjoy its crown without the belt and spurs. Of this the Scottish history presents a remarkable instance. Henry III. had requested the pope to prohibit the coronation of Alexander, the young king of the Scots, until he himself, being (as he said) feudal lord of Scotland, had given his consent. Alarmed at the tidings, the Scottish barons determined to crown their sovereign without delay. He was yet but a boy, and therefore had not been knighted. A difficulty was immediately raised upon this point, and the assembled peers were startled and perplexed. At the suggestion, however, of Comyn, earl of Monteith, the objection was at once removed: the archbishop of St. Andrew's first knighted his young sovereign, and then conferred the regal unction.

"Every person that held a knight's fee, or possessed land of the annual value of twenty, or at a later period of fifty pounds, could be compelled by distress to receive knighthood. Every person whose income was more than fifteen, and less than twenty, or in later times than fifty pounds, was liable to serve as a *hobler*, or light-horseman. The hoblers

received the same pay as the archers. They always formed a considerable part of the army. In the reign of Henry VIII., their name was changed to that of demi-lances.

"The archers were arranged in open lines one behind another, like the spikes of a harrow. Their bow was usually six feet long, their arrow, without including the head, a 'cloth yard.' They shot horizontally, and could take good aim at the distance of two hundred and forty feet. Unlike the continental archers, the English drew their bow to their ear, instead of their shoulder. Each archer bore a sheaf of at least twelve arrows, besides other weapons.

"When numbers of the Saxons took refuge in the forest from Norman tyranny, they had recourse to the bow for vengeance and subsistence. The king's deer fell, despite of the king's forester. The latter himself was often stretched beside the former: from the shade of the thicket the silent arrow bore its message of death, while the outlaw retreated with success and impunity. It was perhaps from such a hand that Rufus met his fate; from such a hand that Henry I. was struck when marching securely in the very midst of his army. A weapon so useful, so deadly, became a universal favourite. Success against the insurgent barons in the time of Henry I., and still more the Battle of the Standard, taught the exulting Saxon that his bow was a match for superior armour and superior numbers. When Norman jealousy began to subside, archery was every where encouraged. No meeting, no games, no village festival was complete, without a trial of skill in archery. The popular inclination was encouraged and directed by Acts of parliament; and the English bowman became the dread of every antagonist. Not only the far-famed Genoese archers, but steel-clad knights trembled at the sight of the English bow. Shot with unerring aim and matchless strength, the arrow winged its flight alike through helmet and head-piece and hood of mail, as through shield and corslet and net-work of steel. Even behind the securest battlements the defenders could not escape: the English arrows rained thick and incessant, slaying all that dared to brave them, and entering every loop-hole to search into the very heart of the fortress. Victory was almost certain when such bowmen shared the fight. Hence as early as the reign of Stephen, archers were mounted along with the knights on special occasions; and, under Edward III., it became customary for English leaders to take a number of mounted archers on every expedition: hence, too, it was, that the royal guard of Edward III. and Richard II. was entirely composed of these formidable yeomen.

"Besides the archers that were on foot, there was a large body of infantry provided for the most part with bills. In allusion to the chief weapons of the infantry, the English cry to arms was, 'bows and bills; bows and bills.'" A strong body of Welsh or Irish pikemen was not unusual in an English army. The infantry was divided into 'thousands,' 'hundreds,' and 'twenties,' under leaders, centenars, and vintenars."—pp. 289-292.

In conclusion, we need hardly repeat our hearty com-

commendation of the "Manual of British and Irish History." We regard its appearance as a favourable omen for our young but growing literature; and we confidently look forward to the time when our students shall be able to find, not alone in history, but in every other department of knowledge, solid, accurate, and comprehensive instruction, free from every taint of prejudice and misrepresentation.

ART. VI.—*Brownson's Quarterly Review*. New Series, No. IV.
Art. 3. Greene, Boston, U. S.: 1847.

THIS is a reply on the part of Mr. Brownson to an article in our July number, on the subject of doctrinal developments. Could we only trust that general readers would peruse this reply in a searching and sifting spirit; and that they would fairly compare the real force of those quotations which we adduced from the most eminent Catholic Doctors, with our opponent's attempt to parry their effect; not a word more need be added on the controversy. But Mr. Brownson writes in a tone of so great confidence, and brings against us charges of hastiness and inaccuracy with such undoubting peremptoriness, that an effect is naturally produced on the unwary reader, which makes it absolutely necessary to resume the subject; though the details into which it will be necessary to enter, must, we fear, prove rather uninteresting, except to those who take a lively interest in the question at issue. And in commenting on the effect of Mr. Brownson's tone, we are as far from imputing to him *intentional* unfairness, as he is (we doubt not) from imputing the like to *us*. Such a suspicion, of course, would never occur to us in any ordinary case; much less in regard to so frank and straightforward a writer as Mr. Brownson.

As to the said severe expressions of opinion, in regard to the present writer's various disqualifications for the task which he had undertaken, (expressions which occur throughout the article more frequently, as it strikes us, than is usual in modern controversy,) we shall make no comment on them. The greater the incompetence of the writer, the more signal becomes the testimony to the soundness of his

position, afforded by the circumstance that an experienced and able controversialist has so utterly failed to overthrow it. One sentiment of the kind alone calls for our remark ; viz., the following :

"We regret that the task of replying to us had not been committed to the hand of some learned Catholic Doctor, instead of one who.....can speak on the general subject with no more authority than ourselves, and from the defect of his professional training, is not less likely, perhaps, to mistake the sense of the authorities which must be cited than we are."—p. 486.

But it is obvious to ask, why should the defender be of higher grade than the assailant? When some "learned Catholic Doctor" comes forward on one side, then will be the time for some one equally dignified to appear on the other. In the mean time, surely what a layman and a recent convert is at liberty to write, a layman and a recent convert is at liberty to answer.

Before descending into the lists, however, some very few preliminaries must be arranged as to the conditions of the combat.

In the outset of our last article, we protested earnestly against the term '*school*,' applied to certain recent converts from Anglicanism. But this protestation was in vain.

"Does the Reviewer suppose," asks his antagonist, "that by suppressing Mr. Newman's name, he can deprive him of the glory, or relieve him from the shame, of being the founder and chief of the school of development?.....However great their repugnance to be called a school, they will be so called so long as the theory remains unsanctioned, and they are understood to adhere to it."—p. 489.

What, then, was our surprise at finding, in a note towards the close of the article, the following avowal:

"We have proceeded in examining the theory, on the assumption that it is a well defined theory, distinctly and systematically drawn out, and with regard to which there is no difference of opinion among the Developmentists ; but in reality this is not the case. *They do not, as we have authority for asserting, agree among themselves.*"—p. 524.

In other words, to the protestations of us converts that we do not form a school, Mr. Brownson answers positively, "You do ; you are '*addicti jurare in verba magistri*,' and

I argue against you *as a school*:" and then at the end of his remarks puts the qualifying clause, "I have reason after all for knowing that you are *not* a school in any objectionable sense, although just now I would not listen to you when you declared as much." Our adversary, certainly, is hard to please. If all the converts from Anglicanism are supposed to agree in every minute detail of doctrine, it is a proof that they are a school, formed within the Church on other principles than the Church's principles: if they are supposed to differ on various subordinate matters, it is a proof, we quote his own words, '*that they none of them have any clear distinct and precise views of what it is they are contending for.*' (p. 524.)

The essential principle, however, which we 'are contending for,' is no modern invention whatever, but (as we distinctly alleged in our July number, page 307) 'as old as Catholic Theology' itself. The principle is this, that the Church possesses the power, and has from time to time exercised it, of raising into the rank of doctrines of faith propositions, which, previously to her definition, were not such. If this principle be granted, to say that there has been a gradual growth of Catholic doctrine (to whatever extent) from the earliest ages to the present, is not to make a new assertion, but simply to state the same thing in other words. And yet, difficult as it is to be certain of a negative, we really do not believe that any Catholic writer ever existed before Mr. Brownson who denied this principle; certainly Suarez, as we shall presently see, declares he knew of no such theologian.

There are two other principles equally universal among Catholics, which appear at first sight to be almost inconsistent with the former. The first of these is, that Christ and His Apostles were the sole promulgators of Christian truth, inasmuch that no subsequent revelation can form part of the Catholic Faith; the second is, that we may not consider later Doctors of the Church to have had a greater insight into the Christian Mysteries than the Apostles. These three principles have been universally maintained by Catholic writers; and we have no right to insist on any one of the three, in such a sense as to throw discredit on the remaining two. By the mere fact of doing so, we should show that *the very one on which we rest, is understood by us in an erroneous sense.*

Now, although no Catholics have denied or doubted

either of these principles, yet in the view they have taken of the history of Christian doctrine, some have laid more stress on one, and some on another. Several, especially in the last two centuries, have (in our humble judgment) so dwelt upon the two latter, as to withhold its due weight from the former: they have not denied it, rather on occasion they have distinctly affirmed it; but in their general notion of Ecclesiastical History, they have not taken it into account so habitually as might be wished. Others, chiefly belonging to an earlier date, have fixed their mind so strongly on the first, that (as far at least as their words go) they seem to have forgotten the second and third. But no theory can be really in accordance with the mind of the Church, which does not fully and effectually comprehend all three. When any Catholic speaks then of a "theory of developments," he is not implying the introduction of any *new* principle whatever, but a harmony of principles which have been held in the Church from the first; and when in our last article we said that "no distinct and systematic theory had been drawn out upon the subject by the writers" whom we cited, we meant, that, however plainly their habitual views coincided with those which we humbly advocated, we were unable to cite their authority in behalf of any explicit and systematic statement on the subject, because they had made none such. We attempted indeed ourselves to express such a theory, and Mr. Brownson has said nothing which even tends towards inducing us to change it; but we expressly drew a distinction between any private theory, and the general Catholic principle.

These few remarks will suffice to clear up the great majority of Mr. Brownson's misapprehensions: one among those misapprehensions, which will not be altogether so cleared up, we now proceed to notice. Mr. Brownson views our late article in the light of a reply to his: but how can that be? His article was a censure of Mr. Newman's book, and we expressly said (p. 325) that we were not "so presumptuous as to come forward in defence of that book;" therefore we did not profess to reply to Mr. Brownson's article. The occasion, indeed, of our late observations spoke for itself. We were occupied in defending the doctrine of the Pope's Supremacy against Mr. Allies. Mr. Thompson, in answering that gentleman's work, had introduced the principle of development, and

we found it necessary to introduce it still further. Here, then, we were brought into direct conflict with Mr. Brownson, who maintains that there have been and can have been no doctrinal developments, and that the recent converts form a school parallel to that of Hermes and Lamennais. We therefore (1) gave such "a sample of the high Catholic authority on which the doctrine rests," as had fallen in the way of one individual's reading; (2) adverted to such testimonies adduced by Mr. Brownson as bore, or seemed to bear, against the *general principle*, as distinct from any particular exposition of that principle; and (3) expressed a theory of our own, chiefly for the purpose of showing that we were not forgetful of the other two Catholic principles we have just now been reciting. So far as our facts are disputed, we are bound to answer objections, or else cease to allege them as facts; so far as our theory is assailed, we are bound to defend or to abandon it; but what in the world have we to do with Mr. Newman's book, or anything it contains, or anything which Mr. Brownson has said in *special reply* to anything it contains? Our admiration of the work is most sincere and profound; but who are we, that we should take on ourselves to defend it?

To return. All Catholic writers, except Mr. Brownson, admit then on occasion the general principle of doctrinal growth: yet this notwithstanding, some give much greater latitude to the Church's power of definition than others give. To speak generally, (though of course there are exceptions), Ultramontanes allow more than Gallicans; writers of regular treatises than writers of compendia; scholastic and dogmatic writers who are addressing Catholics, than controversialists who are mainly engaged with Protestants. Thus Bellarmine, though our quotations prove him to have distinctly admitted the principle, yet did not bring it to bear on the general aspect of Christian doctrine in the way that Suarez does, or Petavius, or Vasquez, or Canus. Others again, as Medina and Fisher, go further than we are quite prepared to follow; though this very fact, as we said, (p. 348) shows how recognized in their time was the general principle. On the whole, with the single exception of Bellarmine, it is those theologians who by the confession of all are the most eminent, who are the most consistently and habitually on our side.

Mr. Brownson, however, boldly maintains that the quo-

tations we made are really in his favour. His own statements of doctrine are such as follow :

"All our theologians unanimously agree, that the Church does not and cannot propose, as Catholic faith, any thing not either explicitly revealed, or at least formally contained in what is explicitly believed ; as, ' Christ died for me,' is formally contained in the revealed proposition, ' Christ died for all men.' What is revealed only as the effect in the cause, or as the property in the essence,... is no part of what the Church teaches as revealed truth, to be believed '*fide divinâ et Catholicâ*'. (Review for January, 1847. p. 80.) 'Our Lord has made a full and perfect revelation of all that is *and is to be* received de fide, and He has instituted His Church, and committed to her this revelation as a sacred deposit, to be preserved and transmitted without *addition, diminution, or alteration*.' (Review for October, p. 516.) Some 'explications of the faith' are 'necessary for its preservation;' but such explication 'the faithful knew before its' definition 'and explicitly believed it.'—p. 518. There may be 'the authoritative application of old principles to new cases,' but in this 'there is no development of the faith.'—p. 507.

Mr. Brownson's articles contain various statements inconsistent with the above, as we shall show hereafter: but no one who has read them will doubt that the extracts we have given contain the general drift and purpose of his argument; nay, express precisely the point on which he joins issue with ourselves. We are quite confident that he will himself fully accept the above as a fair statement of his position.

Now we maintained, in contradiction to this, that so far from "all our theologians unanimously agreeing" in any such notion, many of the most eminent in the most explicit terms declare the contrary: we might have said more, but we confined ourselves to what was necessary for our purpose. Mr. Brownson joins issue on our citations, and says, (p. 513) that "not one of them is express for the Reviewer." We purpose to vindicate them every one without exception; and to back them with some others in addition.

We shall begin by rehearsing those of them which Mr. Brownson has not so much as attempted to notice. (1.) The Council of Trent expressly declares, that the Church holds the Blessed Virgin to have been possessed of a special privilege, which preserved her from all venial sin. Petavius says: "*At this day* no Catholic doubts of this, for

formerly this *does not seem to have been received as a doctrine of faith:*" and proceeds to quote, as denying it, St. Basil, St. Chrysostom, St. Cyril of Alexandria, St. Proclus, and St. Anselm.

(2.) Two sentences of St. Gregory the Great are quoted by Suarez, which run as follows: "The Holy Spirit teaches His Church by degrees." "The more nearly the world is brought to its end, the more largely is an access opened for us to divine knowledge." (Review, pp. 335-343.)

(3.) The Benedictine editor of St. Ambrose says:

"What might seem almost incredible, is the uncertainty and inconsistency of the Holy Fathers on this subject (purgatory) from the very time of the Apostles down to the council of Florence..... For not only do they differ one from the other, as commonly happens in such questions not yet defined by the Church, but they are not even consistent with themselves."—p. 349.

(4.) Medina, a Spanish Franciscan, charges St. Jerome, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, Sedulius, Primasius, St. Chrysostom, Theodoret, Ecumenius, and Theophylact, with the Arian* heresy. "From respect to Jerome and these Greek Fathers," says he, "this opinion was in their case hushed up or tolerated; but in the case of heretics who in many other points also dissented from the Church, it has always been condemned as heretical." (Review, p. 349.)

(5.) Döllinger says, that after the earliest times "the tradition of the indissolubility of marriage, as it was preserved in the churches of Rome and Africa, was the only one that could be followed with security. In other churches there was for a period a doubt, or permission was granted to dissolve the matrimonial bond and to marry again, in case of adultery." (Review, p. 331.)

The Council of Trent expressly declares that the Church teaches, and has taught, that he who puts away his wife on the ground of adultery and marries another woman, or she who leaves her husband on the same ground and marries another man, commits adultery. And the Council anathematizes any one who shall say that she errs in so teaching. Here, then, according to Döllinger, were whole churches, in full communion with the Holy See, who "for a period" expressly allowed the faithful to commit what

* This word was misprinted 'Arian' in our last article.

the Church has now decided to be mortal sin. And Mr. Brownson takes *no notice* of this most express testimony.

The next class we shall adduce, are those to which our opponent's answer (if he will excuse us for saying so) is evidently trifling. Thus (6) we cited Cardinal Fisher, "than whom," as we said, "there can hardly be a more revered name," on Jeremy Taylor's authority, as author of the following passage: "Whoever reads the commentaries of the ancient Greeks, will find no mention, as far as I see, or the slightest possible, concerning purgatory. Nay, even the Latins *did not all at once, but only gradually*, enter into the truth of the matter. *For awhile it was unknown; at a later date it was known* to the Church Universal." Mr. Brownson doubts the accuracy of this quotation, which is a separate matter; of that we shall presently satisfy him. But the rest of his comment on the passage is as follows:

"Cardinal Fisher, if correctly cited.....was wrong in his facts; and his opinion only goes to the point that every portion of the faith may not be equally known at all times by every individual teacher, nor in all times and places set forth in the same special prominence:—a fact of which we need not go far to find an illustration."—p. 513.

See the different measure with which converts of the present day and ancient Catholic writers are treated. Mr. Newman had spoken of the doctrine of Purgatory being "opened upon the apprehension of the church," (Brownson's Review, July 1846, p. 350); and the passage is cited by Mr. Brownson, in proof of his holding a theory which deserves the reprobation of every Catholic. Cardinal Fisher says the same thing in other words, viz.; "for a while it was unknown, afterwards it was known to the Church Universal," and Mr. Brownson sees in the phrase no principle calling for special blame. But in sober seriousness, if there is nothing blameworthy in the sentiment, that the doctrine of Purgatory was for a while unknown to the Church Universal; what conceivable doctrine of development *is* blameworthy? Such a sentiment goes far beyond any thing we have ourselves maintained, and far beyond any thing we ourselves hold; as we expressly stated at the time, (Review, p. 348, 349, 350.)*

* We do not presume, as we have already said, to defend Mr. Newman: since, however, we have mentioned one of Mr. Brownson's

Now, as to the genuineness of the passage:—since we wrote our last article we have seen a printed copy of the original work, printed at Paris in the year 1545. Its title is, “Assertionis Lutheranae Confutatio;” and we subjoin in a note a longer passage, which virtually includes the extract above given. It is in his answer to Luther’s 18th article. We solicit the earnest reader’s careful attention to the general spirit of the whole passage.*

quotations from his work, it may be as well to say, that, in our humble judgment, Fisher goes very far beyond *him* also on this subject; for *he* expressly says (p. 17.), that “the notion of suffering ...after this life in the case of the faithful departed...has almost a consensus in its favour of the four first ages of the Church.” Fisher makes no such acknowledgment.

* “Multa sunt de quibus in primitivâ Ecclesiâ nulla quæstio facta fuerat, quæ tamen posteriorum diligentia, subortis dubitationibus, jam evaserunt perspicua. Nemo certe (ut ad negotium nostrum redeamus) jam dubitat orthodoxus an purgatorium sit; de quo tamen apud priscos illos nulla vel quàm rarissima fiebat mentio. Sed et Græcis ad hunc usque diem non est creditum purgatorium esse. Legat qui velit Græcorum veterum commentarios et nullum quantum opinor aut quam rarissimum de purgatorio sermonem inveniet. Sed neque Latini simul omnes accensim *hujus rei veritatem conceperunt*; neque tam necessaria fuit *sive purgatorii seu indulgentiarum fides* in primitivâ ecclesiâ atque nunc est. Nam tunc usque adeo caritas ardebat, ut paratissimi fuissent singuli pro Christo mortem oppetere. Rara fuerunt crimina, et ea quæ contigerunt magna fuerunt canonum severitate vindicata. Nunc autem bona pars populi magis Christianismum exureret, quàm rigorem canonum pateretur; ut non absque maximâ Spiritûs dispensatione factum sit, quòd post tot annorum curriculum purgatorii fides et indulgentiarum usus ab orthodoxis generatim sit receptus. Quamdiu *nulla fuerat de purgatorio cura* nemo quæsivit indulgentias. Nam ex illo pendet omnis indulgentiarum existimatio. Si tollas purgatorium quorsum indulgentiis opus erit? His enim, si nullum fuerit purgatorium, nihil indigebimus. Contemplantes igitur *aliquandiu purgatorium incognitum fuisse*, deinde quibusdam pedetentim, partim ex revelationibus, partim ex scripturis, fuisse creditum, atque ita tandem generatim ejus fidem ab orthodoxâ Ecclesiâ fuisse receptissimam, facillimè rationem aliquam indulgentiarum intelligemus. Quum itaque purgatorium *tam serò cognitum ac receptum Ecclesiæ fuerit universæ*, quis jam de indulgentiis mirari potest, quod in principio nascentis Ecclesiæ nullus fuerit earum usus? Cæperunt igitur indulgentiæ, postquam ad purgatorii cruciatus aliquandiu trepidatum erat. Tunc enim credibile est sanctos

(7) We quoted some passages from St. Augustine, on the controversy between St. Stephen and St. Cyprian, reminding the reader that *now* every Catholic is required, under pain of anathema, to receive the doctrine declared by St. Stephen. But in the extract we gave, St. Augustine speaks of this question as one which, in St. Cyprian's time, "had not been thoroughly and completely settled." "For he," (St. Cyprian), "knew," proceeds St. Augustine, "how great and mysterious a Sacrament the whole church was then with *various reasonings considering*, and he left open a freedom of enquiry *that the truth might by search be laid open*." Again, "nor should we ourselves venture to make any such assertion, were we not supported by the unanimous authority of the whole church: to which he too no doubt would yield, if the *truth of this question had at that period been thoroughly sifted* and declared and established by a plenary council." And a little farther on, "How could that matter be brought to the clear consideration and ratification of a plenary council, unless first for a long time throughout all the regions of the world it had been thoroughly tried and made manifest. But wholesome peace produces this, that when *obscure questions have been long under enquiry*," &c.

What is Mr. Brownson's comment on this pregnant passage?

Patres accuratius cogitasse, quibus modis adversus illos cruciatus, suis gregibus consulere potuissent, et iis præsertum quibus ætas non sufficeret, ad complendam per canones institutam pœnitentiam. Legentes igitur inter cætera, tantam Petro suisque successoribus, in Evangelio collatam a Christo fuisse potestatem, ut quicquid ille solveret in terris, solutum foret et in cælis, et eam exactissime librantes, non dubitarunt Petri successores—modo fideliter et prudenter id negotium egerint—pœnas—quæ pro reliquiis peccatorum non sufficienter expiatis in purgatorio luerentur—condonare posse. Animadvertabant enim propensiores ad clementiam illos esse debere, quam ad rigoris distictionem; simulque perpendebant, quod cum sacerdotibus potestatem donasset Christus animas ab æterna pœna liberandi, multo magis talem in Ecclesia reliquit auctoritatem quæ posset a purgatorii pœnis identidem absolvere. Ex hoc fonte, ni fallor, indulgentiæ manarunt, et ad magnum animarum commodum, si per summos Pontifices rite credantur simulque recte suscipiantur a pœnitentibus."—Roffens. Assutionis Lutherancæ Confutatio. Art. xvii. fol. 172. Paris, 1545.

"The citation from St. Augustine is only to the same effect (with that from Fisher;) or at most to the effect, that, *in some portion of the Church*, some things more immediately connected with the practice of the Church than with its dogmata, may become obscured; and so obscured that a man who errs in respect to them may be inculpable till the matter is investigated and thoroughly sifted, or an authoritative decision on the subject is had. St. Augustine brings forward this as a ground on which to excuse St. Cyprian..... We have found in St. Augustine no hint that the baptism in question was not, in St. Cyprian's time, *de fide*."—p. 513.

What! no hint? certainly not, but a very plain assertion. St. Augustine speaks of the question in hand, as "an obscure question which had been under long enquiry," a question "which had not yet been thoroughly and completely settled," a question, "the truth of which had not at that period been thoroughly sifted." Did then the Saint consider the doctrine to have been *de fide* at a time when "it had not been settled," when it was "an obscure question?" And as to Mr. Brownson's comment about "*some portion of the church*," it is in point blank contradiction to his author: for St. Augustine says expressly, that "*the whole church* was then with various reasonings considering the Sacrament" of Baptism; and that the matter could not have been settled, "unless first for a long time *throughout all the regions of the world* it had been thoroughly tried."

But it is well that our opponent has made his last remark; for it implies his distinct acknowledgment how contradictory to his whole theory is any such fact, as that the doctrine of the validity of heretical Baptism was not *de fide* in St. Cyprian's time. "We have found," he says, "in St. Augustine no hint that the Baptism in question was not in St. Cyprian's time *de fide*." How far this is a true account of St. Augustine's sentiments, the reader is now in a position to judge; but Mr. Brownson's very form of expression shows how necessary he feels it for his theory to maintain that the said doctrine *was* then *de fide*. What will he say then to Suarez? who, in a passage cited by us, and translated for us by Mr. Brownson himself, (p. 502) affirms: "In the time of St. Cyprian neither was *de fide*.....but afterwards it was delivered *de fide*." What will he say to Bellarmine, who makes the very same assertion? These are his words: "Respondeo ad exem-

plum Cypriani, Cyprianum quidem non fuisse hæreticum, tua quia, &c., tum etiam quia sine dubio Stephanus Papa non definivit *tantum de fide* [Bellarmine's Italics] hæreticas non rebaptizandos, licet jusserit non rebaptizari....Fuit enim post Pontificis definitionem adhuc liberum aliter sentire, ut Augustinus dicit, quia Pontifex noluit *rem ipsam de fide facere sine generali concilio.*" De Summo Pontifice, lib. 4. cap. vii.

In the mean time, to any one who shall have read the passage from St. Augustine, and shall also have read the only answer Mr. Brownson has been able to make to our allegation of it, it will appear unspeakably strange and unaccountable that in his summing up, (p. 513) he has deliberately said that St. Augustine is "*decidedly against*" us. What possible form of words would Mr. Brownson acknowledge to be *in our favour*, if such as those above quoted *are decidedly against us*?

(8) De Maistre (Review, p. 345, 306,) in his work "du Pape," makes the following criticism on certain Gallican writers.

"The greater part of the French writers, *especially since the time when the mania for constitutions took possession of men's minds*, all, even without observing it themselves, start with the supposition of an imaginary law *prior to all facts, and which has directed them*: in such sort that if, for instance, the Pope is sovereign in the Church, all the acts of Ecclesiastical History are expected to attest it, by bending themselves uniformly and without difficulty to this hypothesis; and that on the opposite hypothesis all the facts of History in like manner are expected to contradict this sovereignty."

Mr. Brownson, we need hardly say, theorizes just in the manner in which De Maistre represents these French writers as theorizing. "If in the early ages," he says, "less power was actually exercised by the sovereign Pontiffs than in some subsequent ages, it was not because their authority was.....less clearly recognized as a substantive power in the church, but because there was less occasion for its exercise." (Review for July 1846, p. 365). Now De Maistre says just the reverse; viz., that it was less clearly recognized in its full extent. Hear him in continuation of the preceding paragraph.

"Now there is *nothing so false as this supposition*, and it is not in this manner that things really happen; *never did any important institution result from a law*, and the greater it is the less it commits

to writing. It *forms itself* by the combination of a thousand agents who almost always are ignorant of what they are doing; so that they have often the appearance of not perceiving that very right which they are themselves engaged in establishing. Thus the institution grows insensibly age after age; '*crescit occulto velut arbor ævo.*'"

Mr. Brownson answers as follows:

"Of De Maistre we have little to say. He is neither a Father nor a Doctor of the Church; he writes as a statesman and politician, not as a theologian; and is always more commendable for the rectitude of his heart and for his erudition, than for the critical exactness of either his thought or expression. The passage cited, when the motive with which it was written is taken into the account, may be easily harmonized with the doctrine we set forth; but as we should never think of citing the distinguished author as a theological authority, *there is no necessity of doing it.*"—p. 512-13.

As to De Maistre's theological reputation, we cannot do better than cite Father Perrone; who having spoken in the text of certain Gallicans, who reject the opinions of sounder theologians on the power of the Pope as being paradoxical, adds in a note:

"For this reason, some writers in theological reviews have censured Count de Maistre; nay, Droste-Hulshoff..... declares that he has received on certain knowledge that the same Count de Maistre, in consequence of some paradoxical assertions, is placed by Roman theologians in the roll of heretics. I know not from what Roman theologians this author heard such a thing; I think he must have meant *some who are infected with the poison of Jansenism*: for this I know of certain knowledge, that the works of Count de Maistre are *held in high esteem at Rome*; nay, and that the work '*du Pape*' with others of the same author, has been translated from French into Italian, and published with notes by Marchetti."—'*De Locis Theologicis*,' part i., sec. 624, note 3.

Farther comment is superfluous.

(9) Our last citation under this head shall be Petavius's remarks on the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. That eminent theologian gives his judgment, that no extant Christian writings of early times affirm this doctrine, but several from the time of St. Augustine to that of St. Bernard expressly deny it. "Afterwards, however," he adds, "the majority of Christians went over to the opposite side, and by degrees the opinion grew so general in the silent and pious sentiment of the many, that, *at last*,

it broke forth into a public profession; though," as he presently adds, "belief in it has not *as yet* become full, and such that it have passed into a Catholic dogma."

We could hardly believe our eyes when we saw Mr. Brownson's answer to this citation. "Petavius," he replies, "says nothing as to the capacity" of this doctrine, "to be defined of faith." "The presumption is, that Petavius did not imply or believe that the Church could decide it to be of faith." (p. 495, 6.) Now either Petavius is directly opposed to our opponent in his whole theory on Christian doctrine, or else, holding the opinion he did in regard to the history of this doctrine, he believed that it was impossible for the Church *ever* to rule it as *de fide*. Now, will any other person in the world, nay, will Mr. Brownson himself on second thoughts, seriously maintain that a writer who says that "belief in this doctrine has not *yet* become full, and such that it have passed into a Catholic dogma," meant to imply that it *never could* pass into a Catholic dogma? Nay, our argument is stronger still; for, (as we pointed out, Review, p. 334, and have already cited in this article,) of a doctrine which the Church *has* now ruled, (viz., our Blessed Lady's exemption from actual sin,) Petavius expressly says that "it does not seem formerly to have been received as a dogma of faith."

The next class of our original quotations, which we shall here repeat, are those to which Mr. Brownson's reply is irrelevant; we mean, that even if the remarks which he has made in reply to these quotations were in themselves just, still they would be no reply whatever to our argument. This class consists of the remaining passages which we cited on the Immaculate Conception. Mr. Brownson's statement was:

"All our theologians unanimously agree, that the Church does not and cannot propose, as Catholic faith, any thing not either explicitly revealed, or at least formally contained in what is explicitly revealed: as 'Christ died for me,' is formally contained in the revealed proposition, 'Christ died for all men.'"—(Review for Jan. 1847, p. 80.)

(10) Suarez, on the contrary, declares that it is sufficient to justify the Church in defining a doctrine, "if some supernatural truth be contained *implicitly* in tradition or Scripture: so that as the common consent of the Church *increases*,...*at length* the Church may give her definition,

which has the effect of a sort of revelation as regards us, because of the infallible help of the Holy Spirit." (Review, p. 336.) In Suarez's opinion, the Church may "propose as Catholic faith," a doctrine, not only *not* "formally contained in what is explicitly revealed," but so "*implicitly* contained in it," that the definition of the Church, when it takes place, "has the effect of a sort of revelation." He also says of the doctrine in question, that "five hundred years before his time" belief in it *increased by degrees*; that Sixtus IV. and St. Pius V., who refused to define it in their time, plainly imply that it *may* be defined by the Church at some future time, and that all the Fathers of the Council of Basle held the same opinion.

Mr. Brownson's answer is threefold. (1) (p. 495) That Suarez does not consider this, as we do, to be an ethical development. To which we reply, that although we differ with Mr. Brownson on this subject, still it is nothing to the present purpose; and we reserve the defence of our opinion to a later stage in the argument. Whether or not Suarez represents it as an *ethical* development, he represents it *as* a development, in that precise sense in which Mr. Brownson denies the possibility of developments.

Mr. Brownson's second answer is, that those who think that the Church "can one day decide the doctrine to be of faith," must believe that it is "a doctrine of apostolical tradition." (p. 495.) But this answer again is wholly irrelevant to his purpose; for, were we to grant him that the doctrine was an explicit apostolic tradition, he must meet the farther question, "Was it part of the *depositum*, or was it not?" If it *was*, then the various Popes and Councils who have refused to enforce it as a doctrine of faith, have been faithless to their trust; because, in Mr. Brownson's words, "God has committed this revelation to her (the Church) as a sacred deposit, to be preserved, transmitted without addition, *diminution*, or alteration." (Review for Oct. 1847, p. 516.) But if it was *not*, then the Church *has* the power, by her definition, to raise into doctrines of faith, propositions which were no explicit part of her original depositum. Mr. Brownson then, if he keeps to his own theory, is bound to hold that it is *impossible* the Church should ever define this doctrine; an opinion from which he himself shrinks, (p. 495, 6.) and which is in point-blank contradiction with Suarez, with Vasquez, and, on Suarez's authority we may add, with

Sixtus IV., with St. Pius V., and with the unanimous voice of all the Fathers of the Council of Basle.

Our opponent's third answer is, (p. 496.) that "if our authorities were express to the point to which we adduce them, they would avail us nothing," because "we should then have only *an opinion* in the Church, which is not authoritative for doctrine." Mr. Brownson begins by saying: "All our theologians unanimously agree" in a certain view. We cite theologians of the very highest character, who hold precisely the opposite view. And then Mr. Brownson replies: "They are only theologians; they are not the Church." Such is the only reply we have been able to collect from Mr. Brownson's pages, to the very direct and pointed testimony of Suarez on the Immaculate Conception.

(11) Vasquez's testimony is still more perfunctorily disposed of; or rather, the force of our argument, from his language, seems wholly misapprehended. The argument we intended was as follows: If the doctrine in question has now been made more clear by means of the Church, (re jam per Ecclesiam magis patefactâ,) than it was in the time of St. Thomas, if "revelations, miracles, and the common feeling of the faithful" have to be appealed to in order to establish its truth, then it was no explicit part of the original depositum entrusted to the Church. But (Review, p. 335,) Vasquez maintains that it unquestionably may be ruled "*hereafter*" as a doctrine of faith; therefore, it is Vasquez's judgment, that a tenet which was no explicit part of the original depositum, may yet be ruled as a doctrine of faith.

We spoke originally (Review, p. 333,) of this doctrine, as "a tenet which is especially calculated to bring this question to an issue;" we consider it so for the reason we have already more than once expressed. It is impossible for any Catholic to suppose that this doctrine formed an explicit portion of the original depositum, because, to this very day, the Church forbids us, on pain of the strongest censures, to impute heresy to those who deny it. It is absolutely impossible then for any one to believe that this doctrine may *hereafter* be defined as of faith, without going expressly counter to Mr. Brownson's principles. All who look forward to the possibility of such a definition, are ipso facto adversaries to Mr. Brownson's theory.

As the latter gentleman, however, seems hardly aware

how strong is the feeling of many in regard to this doctrine, we will give a brief statement concerning it from St. Alphonso's "Theologic Moralis," a work which we need not say is of the very highest authority; we are referring to his treatise "De Censuris," from sec. 244 to sec. 263. He first recites the various bulls, which favour indeed the doctrine, but strictly forbid its maintainers to *censure* the opposite opinion, or to assert their own as a doctrine of faith. "Still we are allowed," says St. Alphonsus, "to call it, with several writers, 'the true and common opinion,' and with several others to call it, 'morally certain, and ready for immediate definition as of faith,' (*proximè definibilem de fide*);" and quotes one author as saying, that "it is at the very summit of theological certainty, and that nothing except the express definition of the Church is wanting, in order to demand for it the assent of faith." Fortified by such authorities, St. Alphonsus declares his own opinion; namely, "that although as yet it is not declared of faith, yet at the present day it is *clearer than the noon-day light*." (*licet usque adhuc non sit de fide declarata, mihi videtur esse hodiè luce meridianâ clarior*) sec. 249, 250.

He alludes to modern revelations in proof of the doctrine: such as St. Bridget; to whom the Blessed Virgin said: "My conception was not known to all; such was God's pleasure that His friends should piously doubt concerning my conception...until *the truth should become clear at a convenient season*." But there are stronger proofs than modern revelations he says, and proceeds to cite Scripture, Popes, Councils, Fathers, (for "it is false," he says, "to say that *all* the Fathers are for the opposite opinion,") and the common sentiment of the faithful. Under the head of Councils, he mentions that the Council of Trent had actually made up its mind to define this doctrine; but that in consequence of the most urgent prayers of some Dominican theologians, imploring them to remit such a decree to some other time, the Council agreed to do so, (sec. 255.) From what we proved above then, it follows that all these Tridentine Fathers were distinctly opposed to the principle which Mr. Brownson defends.

Presently, (sec. 261,) St. Alphonsus quotes Blosius as saying: "It is wonderful that in our time there can still be found any to call in question the purity of the Conception of the Blessed Virgin, and obstinately defend their

opinion; citing opinions of the holy Fathers, who, *if they were now alive, would undoubtedly hold a different opinion.*"

And another quotation, which bears on the general subject of the doctrines which concern our Blessed Lady, has been shown us by a friend, which includes, (as will be seen,) several passages from the revelations to St. Bridget:

"De Asumptione et glorificatione Deiparæ in animâ et corpore, tanquam de re dubiâ, aut incertè loquitur Hieronymus, aut Sophronius, aut quisquis auctor est Sermonis, vel Epistolæ ad Paulam et Eustochium dum inquit: *Quomodo autem, &c.* Hinc Ado et Usuardus in suis martyrologiis 18 Cal. Sept. non *Asumptionem* sed *Dormitionem* posuerunt, quasi dubia esset et incerta corporæ Assumptio B. Virginis. Dubitationem quoque illius Sermonis amplexati sunt, S. Ildephonsus serm 6, in festo Asumptionis: Auctor sermonis 35 de Sanctis ap. Augustinum Tom. x. qui putatur Fulbertus. Beda de locis cap 6. Druthmarus, exposit in Joan. Arnoldus Carnotensis Tract. de Laudibus B. Virg. et tract de Opp. sex dierum, ac nonnulli alii, qui *excusandi sunt propter parvam lucem, quæ de hoc mysterio eorum ætate affulsit*: quemadmodum Hieronymus excusatur a Diepara ipsa dicente S. Birgittæ, lib. 6. cap. 60.: '*Quid Deus non revelavit apertè hujusmodi veritatem ideo Hieronymus maluit pie dubitare quam definire non ostensa a Deo.*'

"Si vero aliquis quærat, cur ab initio nascentis Ecclesiæ non ita Deus mysterium Assumptionis patefecerit, ut nullus unquam orthodoxus Doctor de eo dubitaret? Audiat responsum ex ore ipsius B. Virginis Birgittam alloquentis lib. 6. cap. 61. '*Voluit Deus, qui est Filius meus, ut prius infingeretur cordibus hominum credulitas Ascensionis Sux, quia corda hominum difficilia et dura erant ad credendum Ascensionem Ejus, quantò magis si prædicata fuisset statim in initio fidei assumptio mea?*' Audiat aliud responsum ejusdem B. Virginis ad quæsitum in simili de sua Immaculata Conceptione, apud eandem Birgittam eod libr. cap. 55. '*Placuit Deo quod amici sui pie dubitarent de Conceptione mea—adde et suo modo de Assumptione meâ—et quilibet ostenderet zelum suum donec veritas claresceret in tempore præordinato.*' Sumus perfectò in tempore vel inde felicissimo, quod veritas corporæ Assumptionis Mariæ Dominæ nostræ cordibus fidelium firmiter est infixâ, quia Ecclesia Universalis illud mysterium solemnissimâ festivitate colit et veneratur."—Siuri, Theologia Scholastico-positiva de novissimis, Tract xxx. cap. 2. pp. 538, 539. Valentia in Edetanis, 1756.

The remaining class of our original quotations are those in which we *have* to join issue bonâ fide with Mr. Brownson as to their bearing. Before proceeding with them

individually, however, there is one considerable misapprehension of our meaning on the part of Mr. Brownson, which it is necessary to put right. He quotes the following passage from our Review.

"Our doctrine is implied of necessity, in the language so universally held by Catholics, as to the essential importance of the attribute of infallibility; without which, we always say, there would be a series of endless and hopeless controversies. For how could this be the case if the Church *always* held explicitly and consciously the contradictory to a heresy before that heresy sprang up? What need of infallibility to declare that Rome is in Italy?"

The "thrill of horror" with which Mr. Brownson tells us he read this passage, must have quite prevented him from attending carefully to its import: for he says, that therein "it is plainly asserted, or necessarily implied, thatthe Church does not explicitly and consciously hold the contradictory of a heresy until that heresy springs up," (p. 519). We said, and we say again, that the Church does not *always* hold explicitly and consciously the contradictory of a heresy before that heresy springs up; but Mr. Brownson interprets us as saying that "the Church *never* so holds." Supposing we had asserted that in England it is not *always* winter, and some opponent were to comment on our incredible hardihood in professing that in England it is *never* winter, he would commit precisely the same logical error which Mr. Brownson has here committed. Our argument is not very recondite surely, and hereafter we shall again urge it at greater length. A controversy springs up in the Church, is carried on with eagerness on both sides, and is at length decided by the Church: and all Catholics are in the habit of saying most truly to Protestants, "here is the advantage of an infallible Church; without it there would be a series of endless and hopeless controversies." All Catholics say this; yet they could *not* say it with truth if Mr. Brownson's theory were just. For if the true doctrine on the subject (whatever it is) had been an *explicit* part of the original depositum, then it would from the first (on Mr. Brownson's own showing) have been explicitly taught: but if it was explicitly taught, no controversy could possibly have arisen *within* the Church on the subject; as those who opposed the true doctrine would at once have been excommunicated as heretics. Hence it follows, that any doctrine on which a controversy is

carried on for any length of time within the Church, was no *explicit* part of the original depositum. But all Catholics agree that such a doctrine may be ultimately defined by the Church, and so an end put to the controversy: therefore all Catholics agree, that a doctrine which was no *explicit* part of the original depositum may be ultimately defined by the Church. And this is the exact point at issue between Mr. Brownson and ourselves.

For our own part we hold with Father Perrone on the subject. He says:

"If a theologian has to contend with heretics, in the first place the question must receive his attention, whether this be done *before or after the Church has given her definition*. Further, if, before the Church's definition, a theologian has to attack innovators, he must consider the nature of that truth which is attacked by the heretics. For sometimes the evil and heretical character of their doctrine is so plain, that it is enough to institute a comparison between the doctrine [on the one hand] which the Church professes openly, and in the face of day, concerning any article as of faith, (*veluti de fide*); and, [on the other hand], the aggression of the innovators, [that this is enough, I say,] for the theologian immediately to discover and show that this doctrine is plainly heretical. Thus, e. g., when Arius attacked the divinity of the Word, he was immediately treated as a heretic, even before the celebration of the Nicene Synod; and the same may justly be said of many others. *But not all matters which come into controversy are of this nature*; since there are many which are contained in the deposit of faith as in a germ, (*siquidem plura sunt, quæ veluti in germine continentur in deposito fidei*), or in which tradition is not sufficiently clear; of which kind, for instance, was the question in St. Cyprian's time concerning the worth of Baptism given by heretics. Since this is so.....the theologian must take especial care not to anticipate the Church's judgment."*

Now, to consider Mr. Brownson's comments on (12) the passage in which Suarez closes his formal examination of the whole subject. "One difficulty," Suarez says, "of considerable importance remains to be considered; viz., whether faith has increased in the Church of Christ, as to some propositions *which are to be believed of faith at a later time*, which before were not believed as of faith." He then proceeds, according to the well-known scholastic method, to state the arguments *opposed* to the conclusion

* De Locis Theologicis, part 3. sec. 339.

which he intends to draw ; a passage which Mr. Brownson most strangely treats as conveying Suarez's own opinion. The latter, however, gives his own judgment as follows.

"I say, therefore, briefly, that it is to be asserted simply that the Church *delivers no new faith*, but always *confirms and unfolds (explicare)* the ancient one ; for on this account it always refers to Scripture and the Apostolic Traditions ; and so, also, the ancient Fathers teach."

So far, of course, our opponent and we are agreed : the question between us being precisely, whether the Church may or may not define propositions, which were *implicitly* but *not explicitly* contained in this ancient doctrine. This question Suarez now proceeds to handle.

"Yet, notwithstanding this," he says, "it is still true that a proposition* *may be now explicitly believed de fide, which before was not explicitly believed by the Church, though it was contained implicitly in the Ancient Doctrine.* This is proved by the examples above mentioned, (viz., the doctrine that Jesus Christ had two wills, that the blessed Virgin never committed venial sin, that justification is by an inherent quality), and an excellent example is also afforded by the question concerning baptism given by a heretic. . . .for in the time of Cyprian neither was *de fide*, and therefore, although he and Pope Stephen held opposite sentiments, yet they remained in the unity of the same faith, because Stephen made no definition. And many like examples may be brought forward ; and beyond doubt this belongs to the Church's power of defining. Nor is a new revelation necessary for this, but the infallible assistance of the Holy Spirit suffices for *unfolding and proposing explicitly that which before was only contained implicitly in the revealed doctrines.* And in this sense the authors are to be explained. For that explication which we say that the Church can make, is sometimes through the *explication of a new proposition which was contained in the old doctrines.* But this proposition is never a new article, because it does not appertain to the as it were *substantialem materiam* of the faith, which is explicitly to be believed by all ; for that was always sufficiently explained in the 'symbolum ;' but it often appertains to the doctrine of faith, which is necessary to be known by doctors of the church, according to the variety and necessity of the times."

* Verum est aliquam propositionem explicitè nunc credi de fide : it is not necessary, we suppose, to set to work formally to prove that this cannot mean "some one single proposition ;" because Suarez immediately proceeds to refer to three, and to specify a fourth.

The reader may be curious to see how Mr. Brownson meets testimony so express in our behalf: and very singular is his mode of doing so. He rests his answer on three arguments. The one which we shall first specify, here follows in Mr. Brownson's own words.

"If we suppose him (Suarez) to maintain that this doctrine (that Christ has two wills) was only implicitly believed at first, and has been explicitly believed only by the lapse of time, we must suppose him to maintain that it was not *de fide* prior to its definition against the Monothelites, and then that before that definition the dogma of the Monothelites was not a heresy,—a proposition which we cannot persuade ourselves Suarez was the man to maintain." p. 506.

We cite this first, in order to show distinctly what the point at issue is between Mr. Brownson and ourselves: it is this, whether Suarez considers this doctrine to have been on the one hand but *implicitly* believed at first, and *explicitly* believed only by the lapse of time; or, on the other hand, to have been from the first explicitly believed. Mr. Brownson affirms the latter, we the former.

Now certainly Suarez's words seem tolerably distinct. "It is true," he says, "that a proposition may be now explicitly believed of faith, which before was not explicitly believed by the church, though it was contained implicitly in the ancient doctrine. *This is proved by the examples above mentioned.*" And on referring back to the examples, we find the following passage. "After the coming of Christ* many propositions have been defined *de fide* which before were not *de fide*: as *that Christ had two wills, &c.*" From the manner in which this passage occurs in its own place, we could not tell for certain how far it contains Suarez's own judgment; but where he is avowedly giving his own judgment, he refers to it (as we see) with assent and approbation. The controversy is decided in our favour on the very point chosen by Mr. Brownson to bring it to an issue.

As to Mr. Brownson's allegation, (p. 505) that such a sentiment is opposed to Scripture, Pope Agatho and the 6th Ecumenical Council, Suarez had as good a right to

* That is, as the context shows beyond possible question, "*During the times which have succeeded the coming of Christ,*" many propositions, &c.

his interpretation of those authorities as Mr. Brownson, Tournely, and Antonius, (p. 506) have to theirs. But if it be meant that the opinion is so paradoxical that it is impossible Suarez can have intended it, it is sufficient to refer to Canus, quoted by us in our former article, (p. 338) who directly specifies this doctrine as one not "expressly revealed by the apostles," (or *to* the apostles, *apostolis expressè revelatum*.) but a conclusion from two premisses; one revealed, the other naturally certain.

Another of Mr. Brownson's replies is the following. "This new proposition," he says, (of which Suarez speaks) "is not something new *proposed* by the church, but a new proposition *defined* by the church," (p. 503.) We do not understand the distinction; but Suarez's words happen to be express. "The infallible assistance of the Holy Ghost suffices for unfolding and *proposing* explicitly, that which before was only contained implicitly in the revealed doctrines." "Secondly," adds our opponent, "it is never a new article; it cannot then be a development." We mentioned in our last number the meaning of the word "article;" but as Mr. Brownson has not alluded to our explanation, we may as well quote Suarez himself. "The symbol," he says, "means some brief summary made up of the various *articles of faith*." "All agree that *not every proposition de fide is an article of faith*."* The simple meaning of our author's words (as one would have thought it impossible to misunderstand) is, that this newly defined proposition is not required to be *explicitly* known by all Christians in order to salvation, though it *is* required to be believed as *of faith* by those who *do* know it. It is *not* an *article of the faith*, it is a *proposition de fide*. If "the infallible assistance of the Holy Ghost" is given to the Church for the purpose of "proposing explicitly" from time to time "what before was contained only implicitly in the revealed doctrines"—and this is Suarez's distinct judgment—how is the relevancy and cogency of this fact interfered with by the assertion (which no sane man who thought twice on the subject could possibly doubt) that the

* Applicata est hæc vox symbolum ab Ecclesia ad significandam quandam brevem summam seu regulam fidei ex variis articulis fidei collectam. Conveniunt omnes non omnem propositionem de fide esse articulum fidei, licet è converso omnis articulus fidei sit propositio de fide credenda. De Fide Disp. 2, sec. v. (chap. 1, 10.)

great body of Christians have no obligation to make themselves acquainted with these new definitions? It would be indeed a strange hypothesis, that the multitude of Catholics are bound to study e. g. the canons and decrees of the council of Trent; but it would be an equally strange hypothesis, that those who *do* study them are not required to believe them as doctrines of faith. They are "propositions of faith;" they are *not* "articles appertaining to the substance of the Faith, which is *explicitly* to be believed by all." What can be plainer or more simple?

Mr. Brownson's remaining argument on this passage is grounded on the paragraph which follows it, and which we also quoted in our last number. Let us put on paper again this paragraph.

"Lastly, (in consequence of the remark made concerning the Apostles), we may distinguish a two-fold order of propositions which are *explicitly* believed in the lapse of time, (*successu temporum explicitè creduntur*), for some belong, as it were, to the *substance* of the mysteries, as in the mystery of the Incarnation, that Christ had two wills; and in the mystery of the Eucharist, that the substance of bread does not remain after consecration, and the like; and, concerning propositions of this kind, we must believe that they were believed by the Apostles, not implicitly only, but explicitly; because they understood excellently the Scriptures, and all those Mysteries which pertain to the tradition of faith. Other propositions are contingent, which in the time of the apostles had not happened; as that this man is Pope, that this is a true Council, and the like; and these need not have been known by the apostles explicitly, but only in the universal; because it was not necessary that all future events should be revealed to them."

We should not have thought it possible, until we saw our opponent's comment, that this passage could have been misunderstood. In the early part of the chapter, (as we mentioned in our former article) Suarez had made mention of a difficulty which had been raised concerning the Apostles; viz., that if Christian doctrine be supposed to *grow*, it would appear to follow that the apostles had *less explicit* knowledge of the Faith than later doctors; "an opinion," says he, "which has been commonly reprobated by theologians as even temerarious." In the present paragraph, then, he is explaining in what sense this *may* be granted, in what it *may not*. It *may* be granted in regard to such matters as *did not exist* in the Apostles' time; as, for instance, they knew nothing about the Council of Trent;

whereas a Catholic of the present day may hold even as a proposition of faith that that was a true Council. It may *not* be granted in regard e. g. to the Immaculate Conception; for the true doctrine, whatever it be, on that subject, was most unquestionably known to the Apostles. But here Mr. Brownson makes the strangest mistake in the world. All those various propositions which, as "belonging to the *substance* of the Mysteries," the Apostles must have explicitly believed, Mr. Brownson regards as identical with "the as it were substance of the Faith which is *explicitly to be believed by all*," mentioned in the former paragraph: and on this confusion of his own, founds an elaborate argument against us. A moment's consideration surely would have saved him from so extraordinary an oversight; for Mr. Brownson's statement comes to this, that every doctrine and proposition concerning the Faith which the Apostles knew in virtue of their inspiration, every dogma defined by the Church from that day down to this, and every dogma that ever will be defined,—that all these dogmata it is required of every individual private Christian that he shall *explicitly believe*. One is at a loss whereat to marvel most, at the idea as to Apostolic inspiration, or the idea as to a rustic's intellectual capacity, which is implied in such a sentiment.

And it is as impossible to reconcile Mr. Brownson's interpretation with his author's words, as it is with common sense. One of the examples expressly given by Suarez, of a doctrine *explicitly* believed by the Apostles, is that of our Lord's two wills; and that every doctrine, as we have seen, he had just before mentioned, as one which was *not* explicitly believed by the Church in general before its definition. Nay, his very words in the paragraph now before us, divide those doctrines, "which in lapse of time are explicitly believed," into two classes; the one of which the Apostles did, the other they did not, explicitly believe. The very words, then, imply, by a mere logical process, that there are some doctrines which were explicitly believed by the Apostles, which yet were *not* explicitly believed in the Church at large except "by lapse of time." Mr. Brownson himself feels the force of this observation, and attempts to meet it by saying, that these propositions were "always sufficiently explained *quoad fideles*," and that the "explicitness *acquired in the lapse of time* which Suarez predicates of them, is explicitness only contra

errores insurgentes." But he should allow Suarez to explain the meaning of his own words: and he expressly says, as we quoted in our last article, "what is believed *implicitly*, is not really *known at all*; nor does the intellect form a special conception (*proprium conceptum*) of a proposition which is said to be believed only implicitly, but only of *another in which it is contained*." Those propositions, then, which are not believed explicitly, according to strictness of speech (in Suarez's opinion) are not known at all; and most certainly, therefore, are not "explained quoad fideles."

It may be urged, that at last Suarez has not explained *how* it was that the Apostles did not explicitly teach all that they explicitly knew, or on what principle they were guided in their disclosures. This is true: if Suarez had explained this, he would have done precisely what in our last article we professed he had *not* done, viz., drawn out a consistent and systematic theory of developments. This cannot, however, be regarded by any Catholic as a special difficulty; because all must acknowledge the general fact, that the Apostles *did not* make all that they knew of the Christian Faith an explicit part of the original depositum. Take, for instance, the doctrine on which we have already so often spoken, that of the Immaculate Conception. No Catholic will be bold enough to deny that the Apostles knew the truth on this subject: yet certainly that truth was no explicit part of the depositum, for to this day neither party are allowed to designate the other as heretical. For our own part, we did attempt to give an account of the general principle on which the Apostles may be supposed to have proceeded. Let Mr. Brownson or any one else show cause against what we have said on the subject, and their objections shall meet with every attention. But whatever be the value of our own efforts, the facts and authorities we cited remain as they were.

We must not, however, conclude our remarks on Suarez, without noticing another passage of his which our opponent has cited (p. 509) at second-hand, as opposed to us. Had Mr. Brownson himself looked at this passage, he would have seen that it gives even additional corroboration to the view of Suarez's doctrine which we had taken. We referred to it indeed with no sort of misgiving; for no writer is found at all times more accurate and consistent with himself than Suarez: thus the passage on the Immaculate

Conception, quoted a few pages back, will strike every one as singularly consistent in its language and tone of thought with that we have been just discussing, though they stand widely apart from each other in his works. Much more was it unlikely that the passage referred to by Mr. Brownson, which is in the very next disputation to that which contains the above extract, should contain anything contradictory to what is there so clearly expressed.

The subject of the section, to which Mr. Brownson refers on Tournely's authority, (*De Fide*, Disp. 3. Sec. x.) is whether "virtual or mediate revelation" suffices to constitute "the formal object of faith;" or in other words, (we still quote our author) suffices in order that a doctrine shall be "believed by infused faith." And a doctrine is called *virtually* or *mediately* revealed, when, though not itself declared by God, it is *included* in what is so contained. "So that," says our author, "the question comes to be pretty well the same with that well-known question, whether a proposition, obtained by discursus from two principles of faith, or from two whereof one is of faith and one is a truth known by natural reason, whether such a proposition is to be believed as of faith (*credenda sit de fide*)."
And first he considers the question, *before* any definition of the Church has sanctioned such a proposition. Even so, the affirmative is maintained (he says) by *Cano*, *Vega*, and *Vasquez*; the negative is held, however, by others that he names. *Molina*, he adds, ("*which is astonishing*,") considers that such conclusions are not believed *de fide*, even when defined by the Church; his reason being, that the Church cannot make that to be of faith which before was not so. And if he is asked what do we gain by the Church's definition, he replies, we gain a sure knowledge that such or such a doctrine is *mediately* certain *de fide*.

Suarez then gives his own judgment; of which we quote from the concluding part.

"Thirdly, it is to be said that a theological conclusion which *before was contained only virtually in the revealed doctrines*, after it is defined by the Church *is formally and most properly of faith*, not *mediately alone*, but *immediately*.....Nor in this do I find a single theologian holding a different opinion;* for *Cano*.....affirms that propositions defined by the Church are *de fide*.....but afterwards implies that they are not all principles of theology: which

* He must be supposed, we imagine, to except *Molina*.

is a different thing, and pertains possibly to a mere mode of speaking on the science of theology. But the reason is, because what the Church defines, God witnesses *through* the Church; but the Church defines such a truth in itself and formally, therefore *now* God witnesses it in itself and formally.....Nor is it enough to say, [with Molina,] that the Church cannot err in this, viz. that the thing defined is *de fide*, mediately or immediately; for the Church does not define in that manner, but defines absolutely that this is true, and that this is the Catholic doctrine—as is evident from the Council of Trent and all other councils. Lastly, she not only defines truths which are obtained by *discursus* from the principles of faith, but also defines the true sense of scripture, &c.; therefore, it is a proof that she has *direct and immediate infallibility* from the assistance of the Holy Ghost, *which is equivalent to a revelation*, and completes it, if I may so speak. Wherefore, although the Church is said *not to teach a new faith*, because what she does is *always to unfold the ancient one*; nevertheless, *by her definition she causes a doctrine to become of explicit and formal faith, which before was not so*, as I said above.*

On this section we have to remark, (1) that even Molina, who goes farther than any one else on Mr. Brownson's side, and so far as to astonish Suarez, still does not deny that the Church from time to time defines theological conclusions, nor that these conclusions, when defined, are infallibly true; and, (2) that Suarez's own words are as distinct and express on our side as can be conceived.

Our opponent himself seems unconsciously to have been half suspicious that Suarez is not with him; for he prefaces his examination of his sentiments with the caution, that although "a great man," still "his opinions on school questions may sometimes be disputed, and we have been more accustomed to see them cited to *be controverted* than as authority." (p. 501.) Here, however, we may quote Mr. Brownson's Review against Mr. Brownson; for, in an article on the Jesuits, in his number for April, 1846, we read, p. (193): "Many of the (Jesuit) Fathers laboured

* Denique non solum definit veritates, per discursum elicitas ex principiis fidei, sed etiam definit verum sensum Scripturæ, &c. ergo signum est habere infallibilitatem proximam et immediatam ex assistentiâ Spiritûs Sancti, quæ æquivalet revelationi, vel consummat illam, ut sic dicam. Quapropter licet ecclesia dicatur non docere novam fidem, quia semper explicat antiquam; nihilo minus suâ definitione facit, ut aliquid sit de explicita et formali fide quod antea non erat, ut supra dixi.

with signal success in the field of philosophy; at the head of these unquestionably stands the celebrated Suarez, who has been classed with such men as St. Thomas, St. Bonaventura, and Scotus, having received from Benedict XIV. the honourable title of 'Doctor Eximius,' as to them had already been assigned those of 'Doctor Angelicus,' 'Doctor Seraphicus,' and 'Doctor Subtilis.'" Surely even those who think far more highly of Bossuet's public and theological character than we can profess to do, will hardly agree with Mr. Brownson, (p. 501,) that on a question of dogmatic theology, the 'Doctor Eximius' ranks not more highly than that Gallican prelate. But we have no space for turning aside to discuss the question, and therefore we must leave it.

We come next, then, (13) to our extracts from Canus, whom our opponent represents (p. 500) as "one of the sturdiest opponents" of developments; though how he can have been so it is difficult to see, if the theory of development had never been heard of till the present day. We quoted six different passages from this writer, and Mr. Brownson, though professing to have replied to our citations, leaves *four out of the six without the most distant allusion*. We shall first of all, then, refer to these four. In the first, Canus says, (Review, p. 338) "that if a Council, or the Apostolic See, shall have *formed a theological conclusion, and proposed it to the faithful*, this conclusion will be *as much* a Catholic truth *as if it were by itself revealed by Christ*, and any one who denies it, will be *as much a heretic* as if he went *against Scripture and Apostolical Tradition*." Mr. Brownson leaves us in undisputed possession of this passage.

In the second, the author says, "that not those propositions alone pertain to the Catholic faith which were expressly revealed by (or to) the Apostles, but theological conclusions also;" and, in a passage immediately following that which we quoted, after giving examples of such, he adds: "Whoever shall deny any of these, *shall be judged a heretic*." *

In the last but one, (p. 340,) the author, in speaking of the process gone through by Pontiffs and Councils in making their infallible definitions, says, that "they (1)

* Qui unum-quodlibet horum negaverit is hæreticus judicabitur, lib. 6. cap. viii.

judge on the meaning of Scripture: (2) investigate genuine traditions: (3) determine *what conclusions are consistent and what are inconsistent* with Scripture and Tradition. And, moreover, that in making their definitions, they consult former Councils, scholastic theologians, &c." And in a passage preceding, he says: "*two classes of conclusions may be defined in a Council: one, those which...are inferred, either from two principles of faith, or from one of faith and another known by natural reason: the other, &c.*" *

In the last passage we quoted from him, he mentions various errors into which one or other of the Fathers had fallen. One believed heretical baptism invalid; another denied any sense of pain in Christ's Body; another expected the millennium; another allowed permission of marrying again in cases of adultery; another said that righteous souls have no true happiness before the day of judgment; and so on with others. And Canus had just mentioned, (as we observed,) as one reason for their mistakes, "because, in their time, some things were not *defined in the Church as they are now.*"

Such being the explicit statements of Canus which our opponent has not even attempted to controvert, we are able, with perfect equanimity, to wait for another occasion to answer the citations he has made from other parts of the work; for we have now reached the utmost limit we are able to allot, in our present number, to this controversy. As to the passage indeed which we quoted, in p. 338-9, we can have no other wish than that any reader should peruse it, and fairly confront it with Mr. Brownson's attempt to escape from its force. The quotations which he himself makes, (p. 499, 500.) from the same work, refer to theological conclusions *before they are defined*; as we shall be able to prove most clearly when we return to the subject.

And that our opponent may not think we are making the crowded state of our pages a mere excuse to evade difficulties, we here present him with a catalogue of the points which we have still to meet. We have to vin-

* Duplex conclusionum genus posse in Concilio definiri. Unum est earum quæ.....ex duobus principiis per fidem creditis, vel alio credito, alio lumine naturæ cognito, colliguntur: alterum autem, &c.

dicare, (14) our quotation from Vasquez; (15) those from Bellarmine, (the consideration of which will lead us to the distinction Mr. Brownson attempts to draw between a syllogism where *both* the premisses are revealed, or only one;) (16) that from Dollinger, about the Pope's power; (17) that from St. Vincent of Lerins; (18) that from Moehler. In connection also with these two last, we have, (in answer to our adversary's challenge,) to consider developments on the doctrine of the Trinity, to answer Bossuet, and explain Bossuet's quotations. We have further to defend our own psychology on two points, (Brownson, pp. 490, 494); to meet the new quotation from St. Augustine, (p. 510); to mention how far we agree in our opponent's statement of our theory, (p. 524);* and to explain the passage he has cited from the Council of Trent, (p. 517).

The library to which we have access has ten or twelve volumes of Tournely, but we can find no such passage in any treatise of his "De Censuris" as Mr. Brownson has quoted, (p. 510); perhaps some kind friend will furnish us with a correct reference. But that Tournely does not side with our opponent on the whole, is plain from an extract we took occasion to make from his works; for, on the question of heretical baptism, he distinctly affirms that Cyprian erred "*re nondum satis eliquatâ et perspectâ*;" whereas, on the contrary, the Donatists erred, "*multis discussis ambagibus perspectâ veritate*."†

As to Sylvius, it is only necessary to put down the whole passage from which Mr. Brownson has given an extract, to show that he is not favourable, but most distinctly opposed, to that gentleman.

"Sequitur secundò, Ecclesiam quando vel definit, vel credendum proponit, aliquod dogma, non *condere articulum omninò novum* sed partim declarare quod vel in Scripturâ vel in Apostolicis Traditionibus contineatur, partim definire ac præcipere ita esse creden-

* In fairness to him, however, we are anxious at once to avow the truth of his observation, as far as *we* are concerned, (we have nothing to do of course with others,) that the developments which we defend are of *Christian Doctrine*, not of the *historical evidence* for Christian Doctrine.—p. 523.

† De Sacramentis Quæst, 7 art 2.

dum quomodo antea non passim credebatur explicùt; quia illud dogma nondum erat erutum è principis, neque constabat an contineretur in Scriptura vel Traditione."

Then follows the passage quoted by Mr. Brownson, (which of itself, by-the-way, is on our side, not on his,) and then this author thus concludes: "nam Ecclesia vel *nondum proposuerat illud tanquam fide Catholicâ tenendum*, aut si fortè proposuerat, plerorumque memoriâ exciderat, ut de eo non sufficienter constaret fidelibus."

Veron is a writer who has, no doubt, said many things which we should consider very objectionable; but as to the passage quoted by our opponent, we agree in every word of it: yet it is significant to observe how naturally that gentleman has recourse to Gallican writers, (Bossuet, Tournely, Veron,) whose tendency always is to disparage the powers of the *present* Church.

The extract from St. Thomas also we accept most naturally and readily, word for word. As to the passage formerly cited by Mr. Brownson from this incomparable and Angelical Doctor, (whom, for some inconceivable reason, we are suspected of undervaluing, p. 510,) we repeat, as we said before, that Suarez, (the chief business of whose life was to study St. Thomas,) understands that passage in an opposite sense from that which Mr. Brownson gives it. What has misled Mr. Brownson, is a circumstance to which we adverted in its place, viz., that he has mistaken Suarez's statement of an *objection* for the statement of his own view. After giving *his own* judgment, Suarez adds: "in this sense the authors quoted, (of whom St. Thomas was one,) are to be explained, 'ita sunt explicandi auctores.'"

We are still, then, without the explicit evidence of one single Catholic writer on Mr. Brownson's side, except Bossuet on the subject of the Holy Trinity. Our opponent quoted against us "a condemned proposition;" we asked for a reference, he declines to give it, (p. 514.) We have also to complain of considerable inaccuracy in one or two other matters. The quotation from Tournely seems to have been wrongly referred to; and in p. 499, a reference is made to the *fourth* chapter of *Cano's work* "de locis;" a work in *twelve books*. After some trouble, we found the passage in the *fifth* chapter of the *twelfth book*. In like manner, (p. 515,) he quotes Father Zaccaria as saying that Petavius retracted certain chapters of his book;

whereas, Zaccaria is not mentioning any *fact* at all, but giving his *opinion* that Petavius's *preface* should be considered, in fairness, as an *implied* retraction of parts of those chapters. We hope, in our future article, to quote the said Father Zaccaria, and see whether he will advance Mr. Brownson's purpose better than Petavius himself.

On our own side we had marked for quotation a long passage from Alphonsus de Castro, which we must pretermit; several passages from Father Perrone, of which we must only give one; and parts of a preface by the German editor of that well-known work of Peter Ballerini, "*de vi ac ratione Primatûs*," of which we can now only give one sentence. That sentence is:

"Multæ dantur veritates, *sive implicitè sive tantum virtualiter revelatæ*, ex premissis revelatis discursu rationis legitimè ac ritè deductæ, et quæ fidei proximæ et certæ habentur, *queque ab Ecclesiâ quandoque proponi possunt fide Catholicâ credendæ*."*

And from Father Perrone:

"Constat successu temporum *sexcenta* fuisse ab ecclesiâ definita, quæ priùs non dum ortis hæresibus quæ solemnes ejusmodi definitiones provocârunt, non nisi *implicitè* credebantur."†

In the mean time, by far the greater number, and all the more important, of our original testimonies have now been confronted with Mr. Brownson's criticism; and our argument has gained the inestimable advantage, that an earnest and able antagonist has been able to find no other means for parrying their force,—than such as the reader has seen.

Art. VII.—1. *Historica Russiæ monumenta ex antiquis exterarum gentium archivis et bibliothecis deprompta*: Aut. J. TOURGENOFF. Pratz, 1841.

2.—*L'Eglise Schismatique Russe*, d'après les relations récentes du Prétendu Saint-Synode; par le R. P. THEINER, Prêtre de l'Oratoire. Traduit de l'Italien par Monseigneur LUQUET, Evêque d'Hébeon. Paris, 1846.

* Petri Ballerinii *de vi ac ratione Primatûs*: Monasterii Westphalorum, 1845, preface p. v.

† *De Verâ Religione*, pars altera, sec. 56, note.

- 3.—*Persecutions et Souffrances de l'Eglise Catholique en Russie*; ouvrage appuyé de documents inédits, par un Ancien Conseiller d'Etat de Russie, Chevalier des Ordres de Saint-Stanislas, Sainte-Anne, et Saint-Wladimir. Paris, 1842.
- 4.—*Correspondance et Mémoires d'un Voyageur en Orient*; par M. EUGENE BORE, chargé d'une Mission Scientifique par le Ministère de l'Instruction Publique, et par l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres. Paris, 1840.
- 5.—*Missions du Levant*; Syrie, Egypte, Ethiopie. Paris, 1841.
- 6.—*The Greek and Anglican Communions*; a Letter, respectfully addressed to the Rev. T. ALLIES, by P. LE PAGE RENOUF. 1847.

"I COULD wish to transport into Russia," exclaims one of the most acute and philosophical observers of that singular country, "all Christians who do not bear the name of Catholic, in order to show them what our religion can become, when taught in a *national Church*, and practised under the discipline of a *national clergy*."* It is to this instructive spectacle, full of deep and painful interest, that we propose to invite the attention of our readers. We commence by frankly exposing the special motive which induces us to enter upon this delicate subject at the present moment.

When that disastrous revolution which severed from the unity of the Church so many of her children, was fully accomplished, and its authors had leisure to contemplate the results of their victory, and to realize the new position which they had assumed; when the first transports of passion had subsided, and men were once more sufficiently calm to interrogate their own hearts, and to reflect upon the past and the future, one common thought seems to have presented itself to every mind. They had separated themselves from the great Christian family; *and with whom should they claim kindred now?* To dwell alone on the earth was intolerable. A new home, new connections, new alliances,—these had become urgent and pressing wants, which could not be postponed. But where, and at what point, were they to attach themselves again to that Household of faith from which, by their own act, they had been so violently dismembered? This was their first difficulty. They admitted it to be one. How they at-

* *La Russie en 1839*, par le Marquis de Custine; *Arant-propos*, p. 12.

tempted to evade it, the history of their subsequent proceedings has recorded.

"We are not alone," was the tardy defence of those who most keenly felt the novelty of their position, and the necessity of accounting for it. "We have not renounced our lineage, nor repudiated our ancestors. We are the descendants of an earlier and a better race. We are the children of those who, in former times, did as we have done, and went apart from the multitude plunged in superstition and error, to serve God with a truer and more spiritual worship." It was from the impure sectaries of earlier times that they were willing to claim succession, rather than acknowledge themselves the first of their race, a new people on the earth, without traditions, and without an ancestry.

From the same undisguised motive,—the uneasy consciousness of isolation, and the imperious necessity of simulating that majestic and supernatural Unity of the Church, which, as they saw with dismay, was only more evident and imposing after their own fall than before it,—they next began to seek alliance, by smooth words and fair professions, with those more ancient communities of the East, whose position was at least so far similar to their own, as to encourage the hope that such negotiations would be attended with success.

With this object, embassies were sent forth, disguised, in imitation of the "cunning device" of the people of Gabaon,* with "old shoes and old garments upon them, *for a show of age*," with set phrases duly prepared, and the concerted supplication, "*Make ye a league with us.*" But they had to deal with men not easy to be deceived or over-reached. The subtle Greek, familiar for many an age with every artifice, and able to penetrate every disguise, was more than a match for these unskilful beginners; and having no mind to form alliances by which his own position would only be still further compromised, he bade them carry their offers elsewhere, and dismissed them with derision and contempt. The repulse was as unequivocal as it was mortifying; and the discomfited messengers stole back to their own country, gloomy and vexed, to plot fresh schemes, and encounter fresh humiliations.

* Josue, ix.

But if the Greeks refused, without even an attempt to hide their disgust and aversion, to make a league with men whose religion had so little in common with their own, it was still possible for those whom they had so unceremoniously rejected to turn them to good account. From that time to this they have not ceased to do so. Scarcely had the first generation of "reformed" Christians passed away, when their descendants adopted the policy, which they have ever since pursued, of hovering, as it were, on the rear of those more numerous and compact armies with whom they were not suffered to act as allies, but with whom, for many reasons, they were anxious to appear associated, and the number and regularity of whose ranks might serve to conceal or extenuate the disorder which was visible in their own. "We are not so contemptible as you imagine," was now their common language,—and it is still repeated by some of their number at the present day;—"for though *we*, it must be confessed, do not present a very harmonious or imposing appearance, yet look at our respectable confederates. Consider the immutable East. Here, at least, are no sympathies with the heresiarchs of the 16th century: the Synod of Bethlehem has anathematized Luther and Calvin as decidedly as the Council of Trent..... Truly all that was deficient on *our* side seems made up by the Greek Church.'"

In a recent apology for that church, to which, so far as concerns the point in question, Mr. Renouf's *Letter* is a reply, the separated Greek Church is spoken of in terms which, on many accounts, it is impossible to read without astonishment. Never, perhaps, was such language applied to it before by a member of the Church of England. The eulogies so profusely lavished by this writer, without a syllable of reserve or qualification, would have been thought extravagant and exaggerated even in the age of Saint Athanasius or Saint Chrysostom. We shall see hereafter how far they are applicable at the present time. The motive of this unmeasured panegyric,—which would certainly surprise no one more than those who are the objects of it,—is scarcely even disguised. *We* are not a very dignified or venerable body, the writer seems to say, nor is the history of our separation, "and the horrible vices of those who effected the change," (*sic*), much in our favour. "All these things are against us. But from these objections the witness of the Eastern Churches is free. Truly,

all that was deficient on our side seems *made up* by the Greek Church.”* In other words, since we cannot hope to offer a very satisfactory defence for ourselves, we must persuade the “Greek Church,” in spite of its haughty reluctance, to do it for us.

Another writer of the same school, commenting upon the opinion of a learned Anglican clergyman, the Rev. W. Maskell, “that the English and Roman Churches will eventually join, and that their junction will lead to a union with the Greek Church,” says: “We think it will take place in a different manner. The Greek and English Churches are more likely to unite first; and their junction will lead to a union with Rome. Our reason for this opinion is, that there are fewer points of difference between us and Greece. Indeed, the worship of the Virgin may be said to be *the only barrier between us.*”† This, as we need scarcely observe, is a still more surprising view than the one just alluded to. Let us pause for a moment to examine it.

“The *only barrier*,” says this organ of the High-Church party, “between us and the Greeks, is the worship of the Virgin.” Do the Greeks admit this statement? Let them speak for themselves.

In the Synod held at Constantinople in the year 1639, at which were present, together with the schismatical patriarch of that see, Metrophanes of Alexandria, Theophanes of Jerusalem, and divers other prelates of the party, amongst the anathemas pronounced against Cyril Lucar, who had imbibed the doctrines of the Reformation, we find the following:

(1.) “To Cyril dogmatizing, and believing that it is possible that the holy Church of Christ should lie; *Anathema.*” How far this anathema concerns the Church of England, let her 19th Article and her Homilies decide.

(2.) “To Cyril dogmatizing, and believing that the Saints are not mediators and intercessors for us with God, saying that *Jesus* is the only mediator, and rejecting the traditions delivered to us, of which the Invocation of the Saints is one; *Anathema.*” The Invocation of the Saints, however, according to the Church of England, Article 22,

* Rev. T. W. Allies, *The Church of England cleared, &c.*

† *English Churchman.*

is "a fond thing vainly invented," and "repugnant to the word of God."

(3.) "To Cyril dogmatizing, and believing that there are not Seven Sacraments of the Church, i. e., Baptism, Chrism, Penance, the Eucharist, Orders, Extreme Unction, and Matrimony, *according to the institution of Christ*, the tradition of the Apostles, and the custom of the Church; *Anathema*." "Those five *commonly called* Sacraments," says the Church of England, "that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction, are *not* to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel." Article 25.

(4.) "To Cyril dogmatizing, and believing that the Bread of oblation, and also the Wine, is not transmuted into the Body and Blood of Christ, and that the Lamb of God is not on that sacred table, nor is sacrificed, without slaying, by the priests; *Anathema*." The horrible language of the Church of England on *this* subject, and its too notorious description of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, we need not repeat.

(5.) "To Cyril, rejecting the worship and relative adoration of holy images; *Anathema*."* This also we should have conceived to have been a "barrier" between "the Greek and English Churches," as we are not aware that the latter has anywhere retracted her emphatic statements on this subject.

Such are some of the doctrines, between which and the theology of the Church of England there is so violent an antagonism, that, as Mr. Renouf observes, "any one who admits the orthodoxy of the Roman or Greek Churches, must necessarily look upon Anglicanism as a tissue of Anti-Christian heresies." And lest it should be supposed that any of the above doctrines have been withdrawn or modified since the date of the synod just cited, we annex two or three of the articles set forth in a Greek profession of faith nearly a century later. In the year 1723, Jeremy of Constantinople, Athanasius of Antioch, Chrysanthos of Jerusalem, and other oriental bishops, attested with their signatures the following tenets, as belonging to the faith of the separated Greek Church.

(1.) We believe that after the consecration of the Bread and of the Wine, *there remains no longer either the*

* Quoted by Theiner, *Pièces Justificatives*, p. 363.

Bread or the Wine, but the true Body and the true Blood of our Lord, under the forms of Bread and Wine." The Church of England, however, believes very differently, and declares with characteristic boldness, that "the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances."*

(2.) "To permit the reading of the Holy Scriptures without distinction to those who have not experience, is the same thing as to give to little children hard and indigestible food."

(3.) "The worship which we offer to the Saints is of two kinds; *the one* belongs to the Mother of the Divine Word,....*the other* belongs to the Holy angels, the Apostles, the Prophets, the Martyrs, and in general to all the Saints."

(4.) "We venerate holy images, for it is impossible to separate the veneration of images from the worship of him who is represented by the image." Finally, all who presume to question or dispute these and the other articles contained in the profession, are unceremoniously classed together in the same category, as "heretics who vomit forth blasphemies against God." And all this is the more significant, from the notable circumstance, that Jeremy of Constantinople sent this very profession to the Russian bishops, as "A reply to the inhabitants of Great Britain," to whom its anathemas specially refer.†

Such then, in brief, is that "Greek Church," in which one Anglican writer sees "the best witness against the Church of Rome," and of which another declares, that "the worship of the Virgin" is the *only* "point of difference" which prevents the Church of England from being one with it!‡

* In spite of the well known words of St. Cyril of Jerusalem, in his *Catechetical Lectures*, who asserts, as distinctly, that "that which *seems* bread is *not* bread, and that which *seems* wine is *not* wine." See also the passages quoted by Mr. Renouf, in the *Appendix* to his letter.

† See Theiner, chap. xi. p. 301; who observes, that "The Russian Church has always regarded the followers of Protestantism as a sort of *pagans*, with whom it forbids the faithful to place themselves in service. This may be seen in the code of Alexis Michailowitch, in 1648." Chap. x. p. 241.

‡ Besides, it is exceedingly unfair to talk as if *we* only anathe-

But leaving these discordant allies to settle their "points of difference," or to dispute about them, according to their own humour, we proceed now to a wider and more general subject; and propose to show, by an examination of her past history and present condition, that the separated Greek Church, far from being, as some Anglicans wish to think, a "witness against the Church of Rome," offers a more complete, effective, and irresistible testimony in proof both of her claims and doctrines, than all other institutions whatsoever. If we are compelled, in presenting the evidence upon which this proposition rests, to extend our observations beyond the usual limits, we trust that the great importance of the subject, especially at the present crisis, will excuse a prolixity which we should have wished to avoid.

That the Greek Church, in common with every other, acknowledged the supremacy of the Holy See *before* the rebellion of Photius, it is unnecessary to prove, for this simple reason,—because she has continued, as we shall presently see, to acknowledge it ever since. And when Photius himself first renounced it, he was so far from denying *the fact* of its existence, that he argued, like Cranmer in a later age, from the fact itself against its further continuance. "It is true that you *have* the Supremacy," said both these heresiarchs, "but it is not true that you *ought* to have it." "The Greeks commenced," as M. de Maistre observes, "by asserting that the primacy of the Holy See, (the existence of which there was no means of denying,) came to it, not by divine authority, but by that of the emperors; and that the empire having been transported to Constantinople, the pontifical authority was extinguished at Rome with the empire." In other words, the pride of Byzantine Rome resented the supremacy of the Sovereign Pontiff after the fall of the ancient capital of the Cæsars, and the transfer of the imperial throne to Constantinople; but they were so far from denying that supremacy *de facto*, that they clamorously admitted it,* and

matized the Greek Church. The Greek Church is anathematized in the Athanasian Creed as retained by the Church of England."—Renouf, *Letter*, p. 12.

* Not as a divine institution, for this their purpose would not allow, but as attached to the pontiffs of the *imperial* city, wherever that might be.

with all the more zeal and emphasis, because they were already struggling to appropriate it to themselves. "It was only in the sequel, and in order to justify their schism, that they proceeded to maintain, that Rome had fallen from her right, by reason of her heresy upon the procession of the Holy Ghost."* That is to say, they amended their first objection, with characteristic subtilty, by inventing a second, and having begun by asserting that the Church during five centuries had accepted her sacred constitution from the caprice of the emperors, they finished by proclaiming that she had subverted, during the same period, the deposit of the faith. They first reproached her with the shame of a subserviency of which their own fathers must have been at least equally guilty, and then charged her with the crime of a "heresy," which they had themselves solemnly ratified and confirmed. †

But further. That the Greek and Oriental Churches acknowledged, before as well as after the schism, both by word and deed, their subjection to the Holy See, is so invincibly demonstrated by their own reiterated confessions, that it is needless to have recourse to other evidence. The immediate purpose of this article, which is to show the *present* state of the separated churches, does not permit us to dwell long upon the almost innumerable proofs of this fact with which ecclesiastical history abounds. We shall mention only a few, but we think they must be allowed to be conclusive.

A memorable example, in which *all* the great Patriarchs of the east were concerned together, deserves to be noticed first. We allude to the degradation of Nestorius. In this remarkable case, we behold the following truly sublime spectacle. We see the Sovereign Pontiff invoked by one of the most illustrious of the saints, to exercise upon a great criminal his awful functions as the Vicar of Christ. The whole Church is looking on in the attitude of humble expectation. The voice of her supreme ruler is heard; and straightway we see the powerful patriarch of Constan-

* De Maistre, liv. iv. chap. 4.

† In the second and third councils of Constantinople, and the second of Nicæa, all of which were held *after* the words *Filio que* had been introduced into the Creed. Yet not a word of complaint was heard at either of these councils.

tinople condemned, degraded, and banished, by the pontifical command, and the patriarchs of Antioch, Alexandria, and Jerusalem, acting, without so much as a thought of resistance, as the submissive ministers of its execution.

A few years later, the same Greek church, always fertile in schisms, seditions, and heresies, has recourse once more, in her anguish, to the supreme authority of the Pope. This time the principal actors are Eutyches and Dioscorus on the one side, and saint Leo on the other. Like his predecessor, saint Celestine, he breaks with his apostolical rod the new heresiarchs; like him he appoints the foremost prelates of the universe to exercise a delegated authority "by the favour of the Holy See;"* the patriarchs of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria, receive and execute his apostolical decrees; Anatolius, the patriarch of Constantinople, whose elevation to the patriarchal throne was owing, as saint Leo tells the empress Pulcheria, "to his favour and permission,"† humbly apologizes for the ambition of his clergy, and submits himself and his church to the Pontiff's "authority;"‡ and lastly, the council of Chalcedon, composed of about six hundred *Greek and Oriental prelates*, promulgates its œcumenical decrees in the name "of the most holy Archbishop of Rome, and the apostle saint Peter," declaring Leo to be "the commissioned guardian of the Vine, the head over the limbs."§

Within the same century, the Bishops of *the whole Oriental Church*, once again, by the incurable malice of Greek obstinacy and pride, the prey of heretics and schismatics, write thus to Symmachus, another occupant of the chair of Peter.

"After the example of the blessed prince of the glorious apostles, whose chair has been confided to your blessedness, hasten to succour us. Hasten as a father full of tenderness towards his children, for to you has been given the power, not only to bind, but also, after the example of the Master, to loose those who have been long in chains; not only to pluck up and throw down, but also to

* *Epist.* iv. p. 419. ed Paris, 1675.

† "*Mei favoris assensu.*" *Epist.* lxxix. p. 596.

‡ "*Cum et sic gestorum vis omnis et confirmatio auctoritatis vestræ beatitudinis fuerit reservata.*" *Epist. ad S. Leonem*, p. 654.

§ *Inter opp. S. Leonis*, tom. i. p. 588.

plant and build up. You are not ignorant of the malice of satan, you, whom Peter, your sacred doctor, teaches every day to feed not by violence, *but by an authority which they love to anticipate*, the sheep of Jesus Christ, *which are entrusted to you throughout the whole habitable world.*"*

At the beginning of the next century,—A. D. 519.—the Churches of Constantinople and of the east, more miserably convulsed than ever,—for it is worthy of observation that almost all the crimes and woes which have afflicted the Church have proceeded from this quarter,—have recourse to Pope saint Hormisdas, confessing their inability to maintain the faith without his aid.† The Pontiff sends legates as usual; but this time they carry with them a formulary, drawn up by himself, subscription to which was the indispensable and only condition upon which the Orientals could obtain the succour which they desired, and the healing benediction of the Apostolic See.

It commences with the declaration that "the Catholic religion has always remained inviolable in the Apostolic See," and concludes with the following words, which would alone suffice to cover with eternal confusion the modern Greek and oriental schismatics.

"Wherefore, *following in all things the Apostolic See*, and proclaiming all which has been decreed by it, I hope to merit to be with you (saint Hormisdas) in one and the same communion, which is that of the Apostolic chair, in which resides the true and entire solidity of the Christian religion; promising also not to recite in the Holy Mysteries the names of those who are separated from the communion of the Catholic Church, *that is to say, who are not agreed in all things with the Apostolic See.*" The first signature is that of "John, by the mercy of God, Bishop of Constantinople."‡

* Labbe and Cossart, *Concil.* tom. iv. p. 1304: Rorhbacher, liv. 43, tome viii. p. 574.

† "Cum frustra se pro Catholica fide, sine Romani Episcopi communione, laborare cognoscerent." Leo Allatius, *De Eccles. Occident. and Orient. Perpet. Consens.* lib. i. cap. 26. p. 446.

‡ Labbe, tom. iv. p. 1486: Rorhbacher, liv. 43, p. 627. When Pope John visited Constantinople in 525, where he was received with extraordinary honours and enthusiasm, the emperor Justin, who had been already crowned by the patriarch of the imperial city, prostrated himself to the earth on meeting him, and begged

And this same profession of faith, as the great bishop of Meaux observes, "with the same exordium and the same conclusion, was used afterwards in successive ages, adding to it the names of the heresies and heretics which, at various epochs, troubled the church. In the same manner as all the bishops had addressed it to Pope saint Hormisdas, to saint Agapetus, and to Nicholas I., so we read that in the eighth council they addressed it, in the same terms, to Adrian II., the successor of Nicholas. Now that which has been diffused every where, propagated in all ages, and consecrated by an œcumenical council, what Christian will reject?"

It would be tedious to multiply the examples which have been already adduced. Every age abounds with them. From the period last cited, as in all times anterior to it, the Greek Church ceased not, at one time by the mouth of the bishop of Constantinople, at another by that of the patriarch of Jerusalem, of Antioch, or of Alexandria, to recognize and invoke the supreme authority of the Roman Pontiff. It suffices to read any collection of the pontifical letters, especially the appeals or responses of the successive patriarchs of Constantinople, to appreciate the full extent of their dependance, and of their own acknowledgment of it, upon the Holy See.* At this very day, the Russian Church, compelled no doubt by a secret Providence to bear witness against herself, celebrates in her liturgical books the praises of many of those Pontiffs who exercised the most undisputed sway in the affairs of the Oriental Church. Thus, in the *Office of the Saints*, for the 14th

to receive coronation a second time at his hands. When Pope Vigilus visited it a few years later, at the invitation of the emperor Justinian, he suspended the Patriarch from communion, and a few months later, by his own sole authority, restored him. The emperors Theodosius and Valentinian, speaking of such acts of pontifical supremacy, say: "*Hæc cum hactenus inviolabiliter fuerint custodita.*" *Opp.* S. Leonis, p. 434. The Byzantine schism does not appear to have been contemplated in those days. The ecclesiastical history of Constantinople is its best refutation.

* "I appeal to any one who is familiar with the acts of Oriental Councils in confirmation of the fact, that on nearly every occasion the Papal legates most openly and distinctly asserted the Papal Supremacy, in presence of hundreds of eastern bishops, (including the Patriarchs,) and that no protest was ever made against their assertion of it."—Mr. Renouf's *Letter*, p. 13.

of April, that Church publicly honours "Pope saint Agapetus, who deposed the heretic Antimas, patriarch of Constantinople, pronounced anathema against him, then consecrated Mennas, and placed him upon the same chair of Constantinople." She celebrates, as if anxious to prove her own rebellion, "pope saint Martin, who separated from the Church of Jesus Christ, Cyrus, the patriarch of Alexandria, Sergius, the patriarch of Constantinople, Pyrrhus, and all their adherents." And as if her testimony against herself were still incomplete, she inscribes on the same roll, and exalts with the same eulogies, the sacred and honoured names of a Sylvester, a Leo, a Gregory, and a Celestine, the very Pontiffs whose lofty words, and still more emphatic deeds, have provoked, in a special manner, the hatred and the reproaches of modern heretics.*

And now we come to the age which saw the first scene of the Greek schism.

The history of Photius, the first author of that schism, need not detain us; both because he is rejected by the Greeks themselves, while Ignatius, of whom he was the unworthy rival, is reckoned by them, in spite of his subjection to the Pope, in the number of the saints; and also because his sedition perished with himself, the whole eastern Church continuing in close communion with the Holy See, by which Photius was excommunicated and deposed. Yet it is worth adding, that, inconsistent even in his guilt, Photius confessed the supremacy of Christ's Vicar in the very act by which he seemed to deny it,—avowed his rebellion only when the Pontiff refused him the title which his puerile arrogance coveted,—applied to Pope Nicholas I., in 859, to permit his unlawful election,—and again to John VIII., after the death of Ignatius, for letters of *confirmation*, of which he thus admitted both his own need and the power of the Pope to confer it. Twenty-seven years later, the clergy of Constantinople have recourse in a body to Pope Stephen, recognise solemnly his supremacy, and request his dispensation for all those who had been compromised by schismatical acts. Stylianus,

* Several other testimonies of the same kind are quoted by Mgr. Lewicki, metropolitan of the Ruthenian Uniates of Galicia. See the Bishop of Hésebon's *Introduction* to Theiner's work, pp. 52—4.

bishop of Neocæsarea, assures the same Pontiff, that the Greek Church is still obedient to his apostolic rule, and says to him in her name, "*We know that we ought to be ruled and governed by your Apostolical See.*"* Every page of her annals contains fresh examples of this confession; and although turbulent and indocile spirits were now secretly kindling rebellion, and from this time forward the disorders in the Greek Church waxed worse and worse, patriarchs divided against patriarchs, and bishops against bishops, and scandals multiplying on every side, yet at every moment when the sacred names of peace and order are invoked, it is to Rome that appeal is made, and from Rome that relief and succour are obtained. In 993, Pope John receives a petition from Theophylact, patriarch of Constantinople, with a request that the *pallium* may be conceded to himself and his successors. If a little later a Sergius rises to renew the crimes and reproduce the follies of Photius, his schemes perish with himself, and his successor returns to the communion of the Apostolic See, and demands privileges and favours from it. And that even in the time of Michael Cerularius, (1053,) who first dared to anathematize as heretical the successor of saint Peter and the whole Church in communion with him, the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, refused to associate themselves to his projects, or to renounce their filial union with the Holy See, is manifest,—not only from the letters of Peter of Antioch, who sought and obtained from Rome the confirmation of his own dignity, and from those of Michael himself, who addressed complaints to Peter on this very ground, and received only the rebuke which he merited; but also—from the fact that the pontifical legates sent to Constantinople to admonish the schismatical patriarch, pronounced excommunication against him and his adherents, *but not against the eastern Church.* From this time the schism, though never more than partial and incomplete, struck its roots deeper and deeper; but still the union between the Churches subsisted, and was maintained and defended not only by emperors, as Alexis, Comnenus, and Manuel, but by all the more wise and learned of the Greek and Oriental prelates.†

* *Epist. ad Stephanum Papam*, apud Leonem Allatum; lib. ii. cap. 7. p. 603.

† Gregory Protosyncellus refers, in his reply to Mark of Ephe-

At a still later period, the emperor Michael Palæologus, who had not ceased to solicit from the year 1263 the convocation of a general Council, to heal the disorders of the eastern Church, and renew the unity which private ambition and national jealousies had impaired, obtained his desire, and the Council of Lyons assembled in 1274. There Michael himself recognised "*the Roman Church as the Mistress, and the chief Pontiff as the universal ruler of all Christians, the Vicar of Christ our God on earth,*" and addressed to Gregory X. the profession of faith prescribed by Clement IV., which *twenty-six* Greek metropolitans, in the name of all the bishops of their jurisdiction, solemnly accepted and subscribed. Three years later, John Neccos, patriarch of Constantinople, repeated the same act, and addressed to John XXI., in the name of "all the holy synod of Constantinople," the most emphatic and unequivocal profession of "*pure and perfect obedience to the Apostolic See.*"* In spite, however, of oaths and protestations, faithfully observed indeed by John himself and all the better spirits of his nation, the schism which the Greek Church had so solemnly condemned and disavowed, was again renewed. On the death of Michael, his son Andronicus, hoping to strengthen the Greek empire, repudiated his father's actions, and renounced his obedience to the Holy See. Like other criminals caught in their own toils, he only fell headlong into the destruction which he had hoped to avoid.† Such calamities ensued throughout the empire, that, according to the relation of Pachymeres, Gregoras, and other Greek historians, "there was scarcely a city which had not been twice or thrice in the possession of an enemy." But the Greeks were now fast filling up the measure of their iniquities, and judgment was at hand. Already they had this in common with that devoted people of Judea to whom their prodigious calamities have caused them to be compared,

sus, to the acts of Macarius of Nicomedia; Euthymius of Constantinople; Joseph of Ephesus; and others, "who obtained the benediction of the Pope," and assiduously cultivated unity. Leo Allatius, lib. ii. cap. 18. p. 874.

* *Ibid.*, lib. ii. cap. 15. p. 747. "Omnimode præbentes vestræ Apostolicæ Sanctitati certitudinem nostræ ad Apostolicam Sedem puræ perfectæ que obedientiæ."

† Vide Maimbourg, *Histoire du Schisme des Grecs*, liv. v. ann. 1330.

that every fresh act of faithlessness and rebellion was promptly followed by some heavy and signal chastisement. The west had sent forth the avenging hosts which chastised the one, and now the east was arraying the more terrible armies which were to crush the other. Already that fearful power which was destined to trample them under foot with utter desolation, was gathering strength day by day. In vain, according to the sublime expression of a Greek empress, "had Europe been torn up by the roots that it might be hurled upon Asia." The Ottomans were already knocking at their gates, and, like the raging lion, "demanding their prey from God." And now once more fear, false and hypocritical even in its deep abjection, urged them to seek reconciliation with the chair of Peter. One hundred and eighty years had passed away since the council of Lyons, and during all that period the schism had been prolonged, partly by the pride and jealousy of the Byzantine emperors, partly by the arts of ignorant and degraded monks; but we possess indisputable proofs that, even at its worst crisis, the more grave and prudent amongst their ecclesiastical rulers, both sought and obtained the favours and benediction of the popes, whose supremacy they did not so much as think of denying. *Never* did the Greek schism, from the age of Photius to the council of Florence, when it was temporarily healed, assume the character which modern separatists wish to assign to it, of a consistent and united protest against the authority or the faith of the Roman Church. *Never* did the Greeks and the Orientals cease to acknowledge the one, and bear witness to the other, until that day when they solemnly embraced both by the mouth of all their patriarchs at once, in the terms proposed to them by Pope Eugenius IV. And here we must be allowed to say a few words upon the celebrated council of Florence.

It was at the solicitation of the Greek emperor, John Palæologus, that this council was held in 1439, under the personal presidency of the sovereign Pontiff. The principal disputants on the side of the Greeks, were the metropolitans, Mark, of Ephesus; Isidore, of Russia; and the celebrated Bessarion. Every point at issue was debated with extraordinary keenness and energy, and it was only after a long and vigorous controversy, that the separated prelates, vanquished by the irresistible arguments of the Latin doctors, generously avowed their convictions, and

proclaimed with one mouth the sacred truths which they were now eager to uphold.* All former errors were abjured, and the supremacy of the Pope was affirmed by the whole council in the following distinct and energetic terms. "We define that the Roman Pontiff is the successor of the blessed Peter, the Prince of the apostles; the true Vicar of Christ, and head of the whole Church; that he is the father and doctor of all Christians; and that to him, in the blessed Peter, has been committed by our Lord Jesus Christ full power to feed, rule, and govern, the Universal Church, as also is set forth in the acts of the œcumenical councils, and in the sacred canons." To this solemn profession are attached the signatures of the emperor, of the four patriarchs of Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, and Constantinople; of Isidore, metropolitan of Russia; and, in a word, of all the leading representatives of the Greek and Oriental Churches.† In addition to these, the Armenian, Ethiopian, and Jacobite bishops gave in their assent and submission; a little later, the patriarch of the Syrians, and of all the Christians between the Tigris and the Euphrates; in the following year, the metropolitan of the Chaldean Nestorians; and finally, Elias, metropolitan of the Maronites. Then it was that the sovereign Pontiff entoned the canticle of praise,—*"Lætentur cœli, et exultet terra: sublatus est enim de medio paries, et pax atque concordia rediit."* If ever there was an œcumenical decision, it was surely here. Once more the whole east, with one voice, confessed before Heaven and earth the supremacy of the Vicar of Christ; and Joseph, patriarch of Constantinople, bequeathed from his death-bed, as his last legacy to his nation and people, that magnificent exhortation to obedience and submission, of which he had himself given an immortal example, and in uttering which he yielded up his soul to God.‡

But Greek perfidy and faithlessness were still to provoke another and a final judgment. Furious at the triumph of the Latins, whom they hated with an implacable virulence, the monks—to whom the universal repugnance to married

* See the noble confession of Bessarion, in his *Epistola Generalis*, quoted by Leo Allatius, lib. iii. cap. 2. p. 913.

† Either by themselves or their delegates. The Russian metropolitan was the delegate of the Patriarch of Antioch.

‡ Vide Maimbourg, liv. vi. ann. 1439.

priests gave an almost exclusive influence—putting forth Mark of Ephesus as their congenial leader, began to stir up the traditional jealousies and prejudice of the Greeks. The emperor himself was insulted with wild reproaches, and insurrections menaced even the stability of his throne. Gregory, now patriarch of Constantinople, disgusted with the lawlessness and insolence of the schismatics, retired to Rome in 1451, predicting the last destruction of his city. Isidore and Bessarion followed his example. The unhappy emperor, fearing to provoke the dreaded Sultan, by whom the union with the West was regarded with displeasure, already wavered. In vain the Pontiff, Nicholas V., warned the 12th and last Constantine, in the spirit of prophecy, that “if before three years they did not repent and return to holy unity, they would be dealt with as the fig-tree in the Gospel, which was cut down to the roots because of its sterility.”* The prophecy was spoken in 1451—the avenging horde of Turks gathered round the devoted city—and in 1453, “struck by the hand of God,” in the words of the patriarch of Constantinople, this Nineveh fell. Two hundred thousand barbarians, more merciless than the hosts of Titus, ceased not to strike till their weary arms could no longer hold the sword. Here fell, with a courage which came too late, the last Byzantine emperor. Here the most gorgeous temple of the Christian faith became, and still continues, a temple to the Arabian impostor. “Weep, O weep!” said a Greek prelate, one of the captives of that dreadful day, “weep for your miseries, and condemn yourselves, and not others; for like the Jews carried away captive to Babylon, you have despised the prophet Jeremy, foretelling the destruction and the captivity of Jerusalem.”†

* Quoted by Gennadius, *ado. Græcos; Theolog. Curs. Complet.* tom. v. p. 480.

† Leonardi Echiensis, *Episc. Mitylen. lib. de captivitate Constantinopolis.* It is not a little remarkable that St. Leo the Great had distinctly predicted, as early as the time of Anatolius, that utter desolation would one day overtake the see of Constantinople. Gregory the Great pronounced the prophecy a second time, when the patriarch John first assumed the title of “universal bishop.” Nicholas the Great, in the time of Photius, went still further, and forewarned the emperor Michael, that “the Greeks would one day fall into captivity like the Jews.” These predictions have received their fulfilment. Maimbourg and Montesquieu both observe, in

The judgment so long provoked, so often menaced, was now consummated. From that day, misery, oppression, and contempt have been the bitter portion of the unhappy communities of the East. "Confounded with barbarians," to use the words of an eminent philosopher, "they bear the penalty of their schism, and remain—significant judgment!—the only Christian people subject to masters who are not so."* So complete has been the degradation, so heavy the chastisement which has fallen upon them, that the Greeks, in spite of the incurable arrogance and presumption which even so many woes have failed to subdue, are compelled to acknowledge from *Whose* hand the blow has come; and Byzantium, like Jerusalem, remains still a monument to the whole earth of the crimes of man and the judgments of God.

"Since they fell away from the centre of Catholicity," says one who has deeply studied their sad history, and long dwelt amongst them, "they have remained completely isolated from the movement of civilization and of science which is ever stimulating the onward march of the other people of Europe. All intellectual activity has died away among them.....In losing the elevated sense of Christianity, they have transformed it into a religion of purely pharisaical ceremonies. The priests have no longer the virtue of the celibate; and all the bishopricks, including the patriarchate of Constantinople, have become the object and the prize of base intrigue, upon which the temporal power eagerly speculates, while it openly exposes to auction these sacred dignities. Simony has spread itself like a leprosy over the whole hierarchy, and they make merchandize of holy things.....The priests, conscious of their own inferiority, carefully avoid all contact with the Latin missionaries. We see no prospect of any future amelioration for this people."†

common with many other writers, that the destruction of Constantinople by Mahomet II. bore all the marks of a divine Judgment. The latter adds, that "*the fury of disputes* had become so natural a state to the Greeks, that when Cautacuzene took Constantinople, he found the emperor John and the empress Anne occupied in a council against the enemies of the monks; and when Mahomet II. besieged it, he could not put an end to the theological passions, and they were more occupied there with the council of Florence than with the army of the Turks." Montesquieu, *Grandeur et Décadence des Romains*, chap. xxii.

* M. de Bonald, *Legislation Primitive; sur l'état actuel de l'Europe*, § 5. tome iv. p. 175.

† M. Eugène Boré, *Correspondance et Mémoires d'un Voyageur en Orient*, tome i. page 152.

"To what," says another writer, "is this Church, so erroneously called 'the Oriental,' really reduced? It is reduced to certain sees, patriarchal and others, without mutual connection, and of which the scanty flocks live confounded with a Mussulman population, which bestows upon them no other notice than to load them with tributes and oppression. Such is the situation of this 'oriental Church,' which, in point of fact, has only on this account some little importance, because Russia adheres to its schism."^{*}

It may be expedient, then, to present here a very brief sketch of the history of the Russian Church, after which an account shall be given, in conclusion, of the *actual condition*, both of the Russo-Greek and oriental sects.

Russian Christianity dates from the latter part of the tenth century. It is true that the original apostles of the Slavonic tribes, SS. Cyril and Methodius, had commenced the work at an earlier period, both being sent by St. Ignatius of Constantinople, and both consecrated by the hands of Pope Adrian II. But it was not till the reign of Wladimir, who was converted in 988, that the nation, following his example, embraced the faith. If any proof were needed that the Russian church at this time was in communion with that of Rome, it is contained in the fact, that the name of Wladimir is inserted in the Roman Martyrology, as well as the names of Antony and Theodosius, who followed him from Constantinople, and established at Kief, the residence of Wladimir, the celebrated abbey of *Petcherskaïa Lawra*, the first monastery founded in Russia.† Nor is there the slightest reason to

^{*} *Persecution et Souffrances de l'Eglise Catholique en Russie*, p. 477.

† There are indeed many more proofs on this point than we have space to quote. Not only was Wladimir himself a subject of the Roman Church, but his grandson, Isiaslaf, sent his own son to Rome, "to do homage to the Pontiff for his kingdom, and to put his states under the protection of the prince of the apostles." The reply of St. Gregory VII. is dated April 17, 1075; that is, twenty-two years after the schism was proclaimed by Michael Cerularius, and sixty years after the death of Wladimir. These are facts which obviously decide the question. Voltaire notices, in his annals, that Demetrius, driven from the throne of Russia in 1275, "appealed to the Pope as the judge of all Christians." For other facts demonstrating the catholicity of the primitive Russian Church, see Possevin, *Apparat Sacr. verbo Rutheni*; Baronius, *Annal.* tom. vii. app. Bergier, *Dictionnaire de Théologie*, Art. Grecs; Maimbourg, *Histoire du Schisme des Grecs*, liv. iv., and the work entitled *Persecution et Souffrances de l'Eglise Catholique en Russie*, pp. 247-8, and 490.

suppose that the Russian church sympathised with the schismatical proceedings of Michael Cerularius in the eleventh century. All the evidence is the other way. As all her ancient liturgical books, which still remain, were of Catholic origin, and approved by the pontifical authority;* so in the extant writings of her prelates, *from the ninth to the thirteenth century*, not a trace of schismatical opinions can be found. When the separation first took place, the obscurity of Russian history does not permit us to determine.† At the end of the thirteenth century the metropolitan see of Kief was transported to Wladimir, and afterwards to Moscow; subsequently, two distinct metropolitans, with sees at Kief and Moscow respectively, were created; and this, as Theiner observes, would powerfully tend to favour the schism whose origin we are unable to trace. In 1589 the supreme patriarchate of Moscow was substituted for the two metropolitan jurisdictions; and in 1721, Peter the Great, instigated, it is said, by his Genevan friend Lefort, who suggested to him the Calvinistic ideas upon the government of the church, established the *Synod* which swallowed up both patriarch and metropolitans, as it has itself been subjugated in turn by its vice-imperial president, aid-de-camp of the Autocrat, and colonel of hussars.

And here let us trace briefly the gradual progress of that shameful and even ludicrous subjection, which makes the Russian church the opprobrium of its age and nation.

"The Grand Dukes of Muscovy," says the able author whom we shall follow,‡ "have acted towards their church precisely as the emperors did towards that of Constantinople. They have made it the submissive servant of their power." A few words will explain by what means they accomplished their design. The patriarchs of Constanti-

* "We have a letter of Pope John VIII. (it is the 194th), addressed to the Duke of Moravia, *Sfentopulk*, in the year 859. He says to that prince: 'We approve the Slavonic letters invented by the philosopher Constantine,' (who was afterwards St. Cyril), 'and we order that the praises of God be sung in the Slavonic language.'"—De Maistre, *Du Pape*, chap. vi. vol. ii. p. 137.

† The ecclesiastical history of Russia is equally silent as to the epoch of the substitution of the national language for that of the mother Church. *Persecution de l'Eglise Catholique en Russie*, p. 507.

‡ Theiner, *L'Eglise Schismatique Russe*, chap. 1, 2, 3.

nople had justly claimed from the first the privilege of naming the metropolitan of Russia. They were allowed to exercise it only four times. At the election of the fifth, Taroslaw I. (1019—1054,) commanded the Russian bishops to choose for their metropolitan, Hilarion, priest of Berestoy, without so much as sending notice of his election to the Byzantine patriarch. This was his first step. His next was to deal with the metropolitan as he had already dealt with the patriarch, and to nominate and elect the bishops by his own authority. But he was far surpassed by his successors in the course which he had thus opened to them. Michael I., in 1108, assuming a still loftier function, ordered the metropolitan Nicephorus to inscribe the archimandrite Theodosius in the catalogue of the saints, and to introduce his worship throughout all Russia—as the reigning emperor Nicholas has lately done, in another case, with still more cynical audacity. It is true that the patriarchs of Constantinople, not yet fallen to their present level, resisted; at first unsuccessfully, as two metropolitans of their nomination were compelled to fly from Russia, and Taroslaw II. banished in addition all the Greek priests out of his states; but on the rebellion, and elevation to the throne, of his uncle Dolgorouky, relations were renewed with Constantinople, to the great satisfaction of the Russian bishops. Matters continued in this posture during the whole period of the Tartar domination; but when Iwan III. had vanquished the Khan, the Russian church discovered that a native prince was a less merciful master to her than the conquering invader had been. In 1500, Iwan announced his design to seize all the property of the church, but was arrested by the courage of the metropolitan Simeon, who menaced him with the indignation of St. Wladimir. But this was the expiring effort of the Russian church. He was succeeded by his too famous son, Iwan IV. This “crowned tiger,” the worthy rival and contemporary of Henry VIII., (and who had also his Cranmer in the person of Leonidas, archbishop of Novogorod,) after slaughtering promiscuously bishops and people, marrying and repudiating seven wives, and slaying a son with his own hands, finished, like Henry—from whose daughter Elizabeth he received compliments equally creditable to her and to himself*—by assuming the title of *supreme chief of his*

* *Histoire de Russie*, par Karamsin, tome iv. p. 533. This

church. He held councils at which he forced the obsequious bishops to be present; promulgated, like Henry, ecclesiastical decrees, which they were compelled to register and enforce; and, in return for their docility, permitted them the sole faculty of ordaining priests for the service of the churches. How utterly vile and ignoble were the Russian bishops of this reign, is only too evident from their acts. It is at once their truest description and worst reproach, that they deserve to be compared with the complaisant clergy of Henry and Elizabeth.

On the death of Iwan, Godounow, afterwards both traitor and murderer, governed his states in the name of his incapable son Theodore. This clever usurper had formed the design of restoring in some degree the dignity of the church, in order to render it a more effective instrument for the prosecution of his political schemes. It was at this moment too feeble to help either itself or any body else. Its union with the Greek church had long been purely nominal. Since 1460, the metropolitans, named at the sole command of the Czar, had exercised their office without even the semblance of connection with Constantinople. The translation of the primary see of Kief to Moscow, and the creation of a second metropolitan, which was the occasion of long protracted jealousies and disputes, had divided the Russian clergy into two parties, as it divided the Russian territory into two provinces, the Southern with Kief, the Northern with Moscow, as its principal see. The pious and learned Isidore, afterwards a Roman cardinal, had succeeded in uniting, for the first time, the rival provinces at the great council of Florence. But the union was almost immediately after disturbed; and Isidore, whose almost miraculous escape at the sack of Constantinople by Mahomet II. is not the least remarkable event in his life, abandoned his ungrateful country, and took refuge at Rome. Kief, and eight bishoprics of

Russian historian is quoted by M. de Custine; *La Russie en 1839*, Lettre xxii. p. 84; who remarks, that "Iwan felt for Elizabeth of England a sympathy prompted by instinct. The two tigers discern each other from afar; the affinities of their nature guide them, in spite of the difference of their situations which explains that of their acts. Iwan IV. is a tiger at liberty; Elizabeth, a tiger in a cage." Her affectionate letters to the monster, dated Hampton Court, 1570, are countersigned by Leicester, Cecil, and other ministers.

the southern province, remained united to the Holy See for more than eighty years together after the council of Florence,* and several bishops of the northern province endeavoured, from time to time, to detach themselves from the metropolitan of Moscow, in order to enjoy the same privilege. But the terror of persecution kept them in awe. Iwan III., seconded by Philip, metropolitan of Moscow, had restrained by cruelty and menaces these happy dispositions. But Godounow, more subtle, though not less ferocious than either, saw clearly that unless the authority of the northern metropolitan were confirmed and extended, complete union with the Roman church would probably ensue. The example of the southern bishops alarmed him. Without so much as consulting the Byzantine patriarch, he raised the infamous Job of Moscow, by his own sole authority, to a species of patriarchate over the whole Russian church; and thus, by committing all ecclesiastical authority to one man, and that man his own creature, he designed to deprive the Russian church of the last shadow of independence and freedom.

Another circumstance favoured the execution of his plans. At this moment, the unfortunate church of Constantinople was reduced to such excess of misery, that the very celebration of public worship was in danger of being suspended; when the patriarch, Jeremy II., resolved upon the extreme measure of a collection throughout the East, and a personal visit to Moscow, to solicit the alms of the Muscovites. Godounow was not a man to overlook the advantages which this crisis placed within his reach. Having first endeavoured to persuade Jeremy to fix his permanent residence in Russia, he next proposed to him the formation of a new and independent Russian patriarchate, which should be entirely removed, "through all ages," from the jurisdiction of Constantinople. To this patriarchate Job was immediately appointed. In the synod of Moscow, where this affair, already arranged between Jeremy and Godounow, was nominally transacted, it was

* Thomas a Jesu, in his treatise *De unione schismaticorum cum Ecclesia Catholica procuranda*, cap. iii. art. 1, gives the synodical decrees, and letters of submission, addressed to Pope Clement VIII. 1595, by Michael, metropolitan of Russia, and various Ruthenian prelates. The number of Russians reconciled during this pontificate was so large, as to give hopes of a general reunion. Vide *Curs. Complet. Theolog.* tom. v. pp. 500, et seqq. ed Paris, 1838.

decreed amongst other things—that “since ancient Rome had fallen from its place by heresy, and new Rome—that is to say, Constantinople—was in the hands of the Turks, Moscow had become the third Rome!” “A remarkable assertion,” observes Theiner, “in that it reveals how clearly the schismatical churches of the East, in spite of the blindness in which pride has enveloped them, perceive the void caused in them by the absence of the Roman unity.”*

By this act Jeremy sold for a sum of money—the alms which he received as a recompence from the Czar and Godounow—all the rights of his patriarchate over the Russian church. The two prelates who had accompanied him from Constantinople, comprehending the full extent of his treachery, refused altogether, both at this time, and after their return to Byzantium, to sign the simoniacal decree which instituted the patriarchate of Moscow. A good number of the Greek prelates persisted in the same refusal.

It is worth adding, as a further illustration of the character of this “œcumenical” successor of Photius and Michael Cerularius, that in a humble supplication which he addressed to Pope Gregory XIII. for succour, he had styled that Pontiff “supreme chief of the Church,” and requested his acceptance of some precious relics of Saint Chrysostom and Saint Andrew.† The historian whom we are quoting might well add, that “such a man would not have scrupled to convert the grand mufti of Constantinople into patriarch of the Turks, if the Sultan would have paid him the same price as the Czar.”

To continue. Job, the first patriarch of Russia, a man as worthy of the office as it was of him, after forcing a council of the clergy to sanction the institution of slavery—proclaiming his patron Godounow, who had by this time murdered the heir to the throne that he might seize it himself; and ordering prayers equally sacrilegious and idolatrous to be daily offered for the blood-stained tyrant—met with the fate which not unusually befalls criminals of his character. He was first cast into prison, and then strangled, by Grischka, the next usurper of the Muscovite throne.

* *L'Eglise Schismatique Russe*, chap. ii. p. 30.

† The letter of Jeremy is given by Schelstrate, *Acta orientalis ecclesiæ contra Lutheri hæresim*, tom. i. p. 219. Theiner gives the Pontiff's reply, chap. ii. pp. 33, 34.

Of all his successors, Nikon, "a man worthy to occupy a patriarchal see, but not that of Russia, which was too unworthy of him," alone deserves mention. He was "the first and only Russian patriarch who acted from the convictions of duty and the dignity of his charge." He was, on this very account, removed from the office which he sought to discharge with a good conscience, deposed in spite of resistance, and imprisoned for life in a monastery. His fall was the destruction of the Russian church. Thirty years later, Peter the Great—whose execrable murder of his only son Alexis, the Russian bishops were too degraded to oppose, too enslaved to resent—after butchering the metropolitans of Kief and Rostow, and chopping to pieces or impaling scores of the clergy, abolished, *motu proprio*, the Russian patriarchate, and by an imperial ukase, dated 24th February, 1721, substituted in its place the *directing Synod*, which still rules, or rather by which the autocrat still rules, with a rod of iron, the unfortunate church of Russia.

And now, having traced this brief outline of the history of the Russian church through its three epochs of metropolitan, patriarchal, and synodical government, it only remains to complete our task by an account of the subsequent development and present condition of the Russo-Greek and oriental seats.

It will not be expected that we should enter into all the details which a minute investigation would require, but which are obviously inconsistent with our narrow limits. It will suffice to indicate, upon the authority of eye-witnesses, some of the main features of that unparalleled degradation and decay which has overwhelmed, like a devouring pestilence, and with all the marks of a divine judgment, the religious bodies in question.

And first, to speak of the communities of the East, those communities without common government or mutual adherence, which it is the fashion to comprehend under the general, but most erroneous and inapplicable title, of the "Oriental Church."

More than one of the writers, whose works are placed at the head of this article, have noticed the inaccuracy, not to say the absurdity, of this title.

"What," exclaims the able author of the *Persécutions de l'Eglise Catholique en Russie*, "is this pretended oriental universality, but a pitiable fiction? The *East* of which they speak, is almost entirely

reduced to certain provinces of Asiatic Turkey, Syria, and Palestine; to the exclusion of Arabia, Persia, India, China, &c., &c., where you find indeed, Christian churches founded by Roman Catholic missionaries, but nothing which resembles the so-called 'oriental Churches.' And even in those places where Churches of this class do exist, are they not surrounded by others which are in communion with the Roman Church, and others again, which are condemned even by themselves as heretical?..... If we cast our regards over the East, properly so called, that is to say, the true Eastern patriarchates, we see nothing there but certain town populations, shut up within dismantled walls, and buying, at the price of oppressions and exactions of every species, the permission to live and to practise a religion which the native population despises or detests. This unfortunate people of *rayahs*, (even if we include the far more numerous bodies of heretical Nestorians, Monothelites, and others, who inhabit the countries of Christian Asia,) does not amount, according to the statistical calculations of travellers, to ten millions."*

What is the moral and social condition of these scattered religionists, we shall see immediately; but the extravagance of applying to such disorganised and unconnected bodies the lofty title of the Oriental Church, merits further notice.

The names of the once great and powerful patriarchs of Jerusalem, Alexandria, Antioch, and Constantinople, still fall solemnly on the Christian ear; but let us not be deceived by a mere sound. The names indeed remain, but nothing more. "How many *spiritual subjects*," says a recent writer, "have the four patriarchs of the East? Probably *not half so many* as the four Catholic Archbishops of Ireland."† And even these, few and scattered as they have long been, are still constantly decreasing. The withered fig-tree, first stripped of its leaves and branches, has died away down to the very roots. "The malediction of God is upon our houses," said a Greek of Nicæa within these few weeks; "instead of increasing, they do but diminish unceasingly."‡ It might be supposed,

* 3ème partie, chap. vi. p. 387. The writer adds, p. 388, that even including the swarms of Nestorians, Monothelites, and other heretics, the Greek schism itself, already split into at least three subdivisions, does not now number more than from forty to fifty millions of adherents, of whom by far the greater part are too profoundly ignorant to know even the grounds of their schism.

† Mr. Renouf's *Letter*, p. 18.

‡ See a letter from Constantinople in the *Univers*, 15th July.

from the language of interested writers, that the whole East was covered with the followers of Photius, and that the Catholic Church had not so much as a footing there. Yet, in by far the greater portion of its wide territories, the children of the latter are found *alone*; while, even in Asia, "the so-called Orthodox Greek Church hardly exists at all, and the Catholic Church numbers, *at least*, as many children in that quarter of the globe."* From the Libanous to the shores of the Bosphorus, along the coasts of Syria, of Asia Minor, and in the whole Archipelago, are spread the Churches in union with the Holy See. The Lazarist Fathers alone occupy Damascus, Aleppo, many of the Greek isles, Smyrna, and Constantinople.† Already the same missionaries have penetrated into Persia, while in Armenia, throughout its whole extent, from Erzeroum to Tauris, are found Christians in subjection to the Chair of Peter. And if we pass from those countries, where the disciples of Photius exist indeed, but only to hide their faces in confusion, we may call in vain upon them to follow us, or to claim communion in any one of those far-distant lands, where Catholics find brethren at every step. They would fain usurp the title of "Oriental" Christians, yet the greater part of the East knows them not. We find them not in China, where, as early as 1661, the Jesuits alone numbered 151 Churches, and 200 martyrs;‡ they are not to be seen in Tonking, nor in Siam, moistened with the blood of our missionaries; Oceania, the newest conquest of the Church, has not heard their names; nor the vast Indian continent; nor Senegal; nor Algeria, where the faith of St. Augustine is preached once more; nor all the long coasts of Africa. Surely it is to these fallen brethren, lofty in words but impotent in deeds, who, even in the few places where they are found, are to

* Mr. Renouf's *Letter*, p. 8.

† See the interesting memorial by M. Etienne, superior of the Lazarists at Constantinople, in the *Annales de la Propagation de la Foi*, tome xiii. p. 105, and the letters of M. Boré, and the Archbishop of Smyrna in the same volume.

‡ *Histoire de la Compagnie de Jesus*, par M. Cretineau-Joly, tome iii. p. 226. M. de Maistre quotes the sorrowful exclamation of Leibnitz, with reference to the Jesuit missions in China: "Our want of union does not permit us to undertake these great conversions!"

Christians only an object of compassion, and to Ottomans of contempt, that we may apply the Apocalyptic judgment, "*They have a name that they live, but they are dead.*" They have rejected, through jealousy and pride, the gentle rule of the Vicar of Christ, and the pretended vicar of the false prophet of Mecca is now their only master. Their prelates, shunning with conscious shame the Catholic bishops of the east, yet disdaining, even in their abject misery, to imitate the obedience of the sainted patriarchs, whose seats they degrade, and whose titles they caricature, "instead of the bulls of canonical institution, which they were wont to receive from Rome, accept from a sultan *firmands* of investiture, for the purchase of which they are subjected to a heavy and shameful tribute. Nor even thus is the possession of their dishonoured see secured to them beyond the moment when some competitor, richer or more fortunate, succeeds in winning favour by the aid of some venal vizier, and in obtaining the deposition, (if indeed nothing worse befall him,)* of the possessor of the dignity which he covets." But enough of the claim of such men, and of the congenial flocks which they purchase, to the titles and dignities of the Oriental Church.

We have said that the number of the oriental Greeks has constantly diminished. This was to be expected. It is but the fulfilment of a universal law. There are two notes, amongst many others, which have always distinguished the various Christian sects from the Catholic Church. The one, that the former yields to the first attack of every new heresy, which the latter, without an effort, binds like a bundle of tares, and casts from her; the other, that although the mass of this or that sect may remain in alienation, families and individuals are continually forsaking it to return to the unity of the Church. Both these phenomena have marked the history of the oriental Greeks.

"The storm which was one day to overwhelm the throne of their emperors and the sees of their patriarchs," says a modern

* "In the year 1821, the sultan, wishing to turn the schismatical Patriarch out of his residence, hanged him, without ceremony, with all his assistant priests, at the door of his church, on Easter Day. His body was delivered to the Jews, and secretly redeemed by the Russian embassy." *Persecution et Souffrances de l'Eglise Catholique en Russie*, p. 171.

writer, "advanced across Asia to accomplish, at the hour appointed by the divine vengeance, their terrible judgment. Issuing from Arabia, and absorbing in its passage the Christianity of the East, the Mussulman torrent traversed the Bosphorus, and carried forward the crescent to the European provinces of the Cæsars; for it was no longer with the degenerate christianity of the east as with that which flowed, full of life and strength, from the apostolic Roman fount. The latter had quickly absorbed into itself all the conquerors of the empire; the former bowed down without resistance under the code of the caliphs, and the Christian populations of Asia, deserting the faith of Christ, adopted, in vast numbers, that of the prophet, and recruited the armies of his vicars..... We fear not then to pronounce upon the two Churches the judgment which these lessons of history involve. The hardy sons of the North, conquerors of the empire of the West, and then prostrated before the cross, proclaim and testify the majesty of the Church of Rome; the Arabs, Saracens, and Turks, spreading themselves over the provinces of Asia and Europe, governed by degenerate Cæsars and rebel patriarchs, and absorbing in their march the pseudo-christianity of the East, announce, on their side, the ignominy of the Byzantine Church."*

Who shall measure the height and depth of this contrast? on the one side, honour and glory; on the other, misery and shame! To have struck the weapons from the hands of her conquerors, even in the moment of victory, and forced them to kneel on bended knees on the very ground which they had so lately won; such was the divine triumph of the Church of Rome, or rather, of the Cross, which is her strength and crown. To yield before every invader, and abandon their God to serve an impostor;

* *Ibid*, p. 240. "Cette ville (Damascus) qui étoit autrefois toute chrétienne, s'est trouvée presque toute mahométane; en sorte que, deplus de cinq cent mille habitans, à peine y avoit il dix mille Chrétiens." *Lettres Edifiantes et Curieuses*, tome i. p. 168. The same thing has happened at Laodicea, and generally throughout the East. "Il n'y a pas quarante ou cinquante ans," says a missionary at the beginning of the last century, "qu'ils étoient tous Chrétiens du rit Grec, et qu'un beau jour, ou pour mieux dire, qu'un malheureux jour, ils s'accordèrent tous ensemble à renier la foi, et à embrasser le mahometanisme: il n'y eut que deux ou trois familles qui tinrent ferme contre la défection générale." *Ibid*, p. 341. Father Rousset, writing from Antoura in 1750, says: "La secte de Mahomet attire sans cesse à elle les partisans des schismes divers qui partagent le christianisme de ce pays." Even within the present age, numerous families of schismatical Greeks, at Damascus and elsewhere, have become Mahometans.

twice to commit the very sepulchre of the Lord to impure barbarians, and ever since to bear the chastisement due to their crimes; such has been the history and the mission of the sectaries of Byzantium. And yet there are men who can gravely speak of these our unhappy and afflicted brethren, by turns rebels and slaves, as "the best witnesses against the Church of Rome!"

The second point noticed, as characteristic of the oriental Greeks in common with other sectaries, was the continual repudiation of the schism by families and individuals. The history of the conversions throughout the east, since the Council of Florence and the destruction of Constantinople, would fill a volume. We can mention only a few as examples.

In the year 1615, the most eminent convert was the metropolitan of Gangra. Throughout the whole of that century his example was followed by others, and in the beginning of the next, 1709, Michael Palæologus, one of the most distinguished partisans of the sect, abjured the schism. In the same year, the celebrated Father Braconnier, at that time a missionary in the Levant, reported, from his own experience, that the conversions were "augmenting from day to day."* In the years 1711 and 1712, Father Cachod alone, so distinguished by his ministry in the east, received the abjuration of about 1200 schismatics; while, at the same time, Father Tarillon, in a letter to the Count de Pontchartrain, announced, that in spite of cruel persecutions, "the number of Catholics at Constantinople had augmented by one half, and in the other great towns in the same proportion. Melchior, a pupil of the Congregation of Propaganda, and now bishop of Merdin, in Diarbeker, a prelate of great learning and virtue, has just succeeded in converting to the Catholic faith almost the whole of his diocese."† In the following year, 1713, the illustrious Sicard, as eminent for learning as for piety, and whose apostolical labours extended throughout the whole of Egypt, was the instrument of conveying instruction and pardon to multitudes of various sects.‡ In 1717, Father

* See also the letter of father Nacchi, superior of the Jesuit missions in Syria, to the father general, Tamburini, tome i.

† *Ibid*, tome i. p. 10. *Missions du Levant*, tome iv. p. 39.

‡ This celebrated missionary, as much honoured by the philosophers as by the religious of his age, informed the Count de

John Verseau converted almost every member of a monastery in the neighbourhood of Tripoli, "which had the reputation of being the richest and most numerous of all those which the Greeks possessed in Syria." But this year was still more remarkable for the almost simultaneous conversion of three Greek patriarchs, together with great numbers of their disciples. The patriarch Ignatius, together with Dionysius, the Archbishop of Aleppo, was the first. The archbishop died almost immediately after his reconciliation, from the sufferings which the malice of the Turks inflicted upon him; and the patriarch, who had received eighty stripes on the soles of his feet, only survived him a few months. The last words pronounced by this generous confessor, in the dungeon into which he had been cast, were: "I place myself at the feet of St. Peter and his successors, the Vicars of Jesus Christ on earth." The patriarch of Alexandria sent at the same time his profession of faith and obedience to Pope Clement XI. Cyril, patriarch of Damascus, the most powerful of all the patriarchs of the east, was the last to surrender; but upon receiving a moving exhortation from the Pontiff to follow the example of his brethren, and to "provide for eternal happiness rather than temporal and transient advantages,"* he also yielded to grace, as well as the bishop of Beyrout, and many others. It is said that a single missionary, Father Bernard Couder, had at this time the spiritual charge of "nine hundred families in Aleppo alone;" and but for the persecutions which ensued, and by which many of the missions were scattered, great hopes were entertained of a general reconciliation.

The same incidents have recurred, at various intervals, down to the present day;† and, within the present century,

Toulouse, that "although the Mahometan religion was dominant in Egypt, yet the number of Greek, Arab, and Coptic Christians far exceeded that of the Turks. The Christians are almost all heretics and schismatics, and for the most part Eutychians. But it is right to add, that they are more ignorant than heretical. So gross, indeed, is their ignorance, that they neither know what we believe, nor what they believe themselves."—*Lettres Edifiantes et Curieuses*, tome iii. p. 167. (ed Lyons, 1819.)

* *Ibid*, tome i. p. 89.

† One of the most interesting subjects of contemplation to a religious mind at this moment, is the condition and prospects

the Church has once more been consoled by the repentance and conversion of another patriarch of Damascus. Having providentially encountered a Catholic priest, long before his elevation to the patriarchate, the young and candid Hiliani acquired early an acquaintance with the Catholic faith. But various considerations delayed the decisive action, which was destined to produce afterwards

of the once powerful Ottoman race. "The Turks," says the estimable superior of the Lazarist congregation at Constantinople, (where the public cemetery, filled with the bodies of the illustrious Jesuits and martyrs, from 1585 to 1756, in the service of plague-stricken slaves, attests at this day the sublime heroism of Catholic charity), "comprehend that their reign is over, and are intimately persuaded that it is reserved to us to gather up the remnants which remain. As much disdain as they feel towards the sectaries, whom they confound in an equal abhorrence with the Jews, so much affection do they manifest towards the Catholics.....Damascus, the *holy* city, in the eyes of the Mussulmen, which heretofore no Christian could enter but with bare head, and the payment of tribute, Damascus has not only ceased to exercise this odious tyranny, but even suffers our religious ceremonies to take place within its walls. From toleration the Turks quickly passed to affection for our worship. Two years since, we saw an entire village of these infidels embrace the gospel, (1838.) We possess even the truth that the Mahometans, who are most capable of appreciating religious questions, are secretly occupied with the study of Christianity. Quite recently a Turk of Damascus summoned a Catholic priest to his death bed, and demanded baptism. The surprise of the missionary was great, on finding him as instructed in the truths of salvation, as he was impatient to receive the sacrament of regeneration. Together with Islamism will also perish the dissident sects, which have only preserved their existence hitherto by means of it, and by purchasing from the fanaticism of the Turks the power to vex us with impunity..... Ignorance alone keeps them separated from the centre of unity. They do not even know what are the points of faith which divide them from the true Church. These erring brothers make the whole of religion to consist in a few exterior practices, which are to them in the place of a creed, and even of prayers. In spite of their antipathy for Catholics, they love our ceremonies, and willingly assist at our sermons. A good number of them come to receive in our schools the instruction which it is impossible for them to procure elsewhere.....It is easy to perceive, and past experience no longer permits us to doubt it, that ere long the return of these heretics will console the Church for their defection."—*Annales de la Propagation de la Foi* ; ann. 1840, tome xiii. pp. 107—111.

such great results. The stories industriously propagated by Greek priests, of miracles said to be wrought by their party at Jerusalem and Constantinople, produced a powerful impression upon his mind. In 1820, impelled by an ardent desire to test these pretended miracles, Hiliani set out for Jerusalem. Here he speedily detected the imposture of the so-called "holy fire." The miracle of the "sacred oils," said to be operated at Constantinople, remained still to be examined. Returning to Damascus, he found that the archbishop of that city, his friend and protector, had been promoted to the patriarchate of Constantinople, where he received orders to join him without delay. On his arrival, the ceremony of the benediction of the holy oils was terminated. He was now ordained priest by the patriarch, and attached to his person as grand-vicar. Some time after he was summoned to follow him to Damascus, and here he was informed that he was destined for the archiepiscopal see. The fête of the holy oils was about to take place at Mardin, and as he was still unsatisfied about this reported miracle, he refused to accept the investiture. Upon the promise of the patriarch that he would perform the mysterious benediction in his own presence, he submitted to be consecrated archbishop of Damascus, on the 24th December, 1824. The promised ceremony took place at Damascus shortly after, "and in spite of the extreme care which they employed to conceal from him the perfidious mystery, he detected the falsehood of the pretended miracle." From this time the archbishop gave himself up to the study of the Catholic religion, and three years after, in 1827, he retired from Damascus to a convent of Syrian Catholics, on mount Libanus, where he abjured his errors, and was received into the Church. He was subsequently appointed Catholic archbishop of Damascus, by Pope Leo XII. The results of his new ministry surpassed the hopes of the most sanguine. Fifteen hundred inhabitants of the numerous villages of Libanus, five priests and a bishop, immediately sought the communion of the Church. And this was only an earnest of his future successes. His former friend, the schismatical bishop of Constantinople, unable to check his apostolical career by other means, had recourse to a policy worthy of a Byzantine patriarch. But when Ibrahim Pacha had rejected his overtures, and positively refused to coerce the five Churches which had submitted to the jurisdiction

of the archbishop of Damascus, the disappointed patriarch is said to have died of mortification and chagrin. The Druses, however, have since acted as the executors of his charitable wishes, and the diocese of Damascus has been ravaged by every species of cruelty and outrage.*

* Vide *Le Mémorial Catholique*, tome v. p. 155 ; tome vi. p. 70 ; and no. 64, p. 145.

While we are writing these lines, the intelligence of fresh conversions in the East has reached Europe. Ibrahim, Syrian bishop of Orfa, in Mesopotamia, writes from that place, February 3, 1847, to Pope Pius IX. that he had just been received into the Church, together with his attendant deacon, by Peter, Catholic patriarch of Aleppo ; and expresses to the sovereign Pontiff his hope that he will soon have to " present new sons to the holy Church of God." See his letter in the *Univers*, 25th July, 1847. The professor of Latin at the only schismatical seminary for the Greek ecclesiastics in Constantinople, (who, it should be added, was a learned German protestant !) has lately embraced the faith, " the spectacle of the disorders and the miseries of the Greek Church having completed the motives of his decision." *Univers*, 5th August, 1847 : The seminary has been since closed in consequence of a general rebellion of the hopeful ecclesiastical students which it contained. M. Etienne, in his memorial upon the state of religion in the East, announces that one of his assistant missionaries, M. Bonnieux, " has reconciled to the Church for his share, one hundred and twenty-two heretics, within a few months. Amongst all these conversions, the most remarkable is certainly that of Mgr. Artin, heretical Archbishop of Nau, in Armenia. The eminence of his talents, joined to the authority of an exemplary life, had caused him to be regarded as one of the firmest columns of the sect, of which he occupied one of the principal sees. The schismatical patriarch of Constantinople often invited him to that capital, to promote by his eloquence the triumph of error..... On the 6th of August, Mgr. Artin was reconciled to the Church in the presence of a multitude of heretics, whom he exhorted to return to the way of salvation. *Seven hundred persons* of the city of Van, resolved, on hearing the conversion of their chief pastor, to follow his example, and came to Constantinople to receive his instructions. Their sentiments were soon communicated to their co-religionists of the capital ; hour after hour they besieged the house of the missionaries, to confer with the Armenian prelate upon the abjuration which they meditated. A little while subsequently to his discourse, the number of those who imitated this memorable conversion was *twelve hundred*." The miserable patriarch of Constantinople, a worthy disciple of Photius and Michael Cerularius, tried to induce the Turkish government to persecute the noble confessor, but was baffled by the French ambassador.

Successive letters from the east, since the year 1840, have announced the recurrence of similar events; and the history of the other oriental sects corresponds exactly with that of the Greeks.

Amongst the writers of the present age who have examined and described their condition, the first place belongs to the distinguished author of the *Correspondance et Mémoires d'un Voyageur en Orient*. Profoundly versed in the oriental dialects and literature, M. Eugène Boré was selected, in 1837, by the French minister of Public Instruction and the Academy of Inscriptions, to undertake a scientific mission in the east. How well the honourable office entrusted to him has been discharged, the acknowledgments of the learned societies of France sufficiently testify. But M. Boré was something more than a *savant*; and having visited the east in the interests of science, he has remained there in the more sacred service of religion. The pitiable spectacle of brothers, bearing the name of christians, but reduced, as to their moral and social condition, almost below the level of their Mahometan masters, awakened his pious compassion. Resolved to make an effort at least for their amelioration, he has abandoned, in great measure, the cherished pursuits of science, and the brilliant prospects of a career already commenced, to labour, in solitude and exile, for the restoration of the unhappy wanderers whom he had visited with another and an inferior object. Ten years passed amongst them, and the most exact knowledge of their respective histories, languages, and customs, are an ample guarantee for the perfect accuracy of the relations to which his own high and eminent qualities add still further weight.

"I am of opinion," says M. Boré, "that the character of our times invites every traveller, even though he be but a layman, to act in some sort the part of a missionary." This sentiment affords a clue to his own generous and holy labours. It reveals also the motive which guided the long and painful researches, from the results of which we gather the following particulars:

In the first place, then, to commence by a general statement, which it will be only too easy to prove by detailed evidence, it appears that not only have the oriental Greeks fallen to such a depth of moral degradation as to present a disadvantageous contrast even with the other sectaries of the east, not only does their own conviction of their fall impel

them to shrink instinctively from the presence and contact of Catholics, but that the very Turks themselves, who, as M. Boré observes, can hardly be suspected of partiality, detecting the immense distinction between the Latin and Byzantine christians, denote by certain habitual and emphatic designations their respect for the one and their contempt for the other. Father Tarillon remarked, 150 years ago, that the Turks styled Catholics, *Beysadez*, or *the noble*; while to the Greeks they gave the title of *Taif*, or *the populace*.* And at the present day, M. Boré finds them still calling the former *Francs*, the term of respect and honour, and the latter *Kafirs*, the Mussulman synonyme for "a man without any religion." "There must needs be in Catholicism," he remarks, "an element of life and exterior dignity, which is wanting to schism and heresy, since the Turks, who cannot be accused of partiality, show always a marked consideration for the orthodox, whom they never subject to the same oppressions as the schismatics. The name of *Catholic* has always a different sound in their ears, and they appear to take it for an exception." Several anecdotes related by M. Boré disclose this habit in a striking manner.

We shall now follow this gentleman in his travels. Having quitted Constantinople in the summer of 1838, and traversed the whole of Bithynia and Paphlagonia, and the countries extending from the Bosphorus almost to the frontiers of Armenia, he writes from Samsoun, the ancient Amisus, the following account of the people whom he had encountered: "Up to this time we have seen only Turks or poor Greeks, in the most pitiable state, and to whom there remains no longer anything but the name of christians." One of the first halts which he made after leaving Constantinople, was at the small town of Chilé, on the shores of the Black Sea.

"They appropriated to us for a lodging the house of the bishop, who, finding a residence at Constantinople more agreeable, passes only some weeks in the year amongst his flock. We were received there by his vicar, a species of married man, brutalized by the perpetual intoxication in which he lives. He conducted us to two chapels, if one may call by this name two dark and moist chambers, where was an altar disfigured by paintings. He sold us the legend of the patron.....In crossing the street, we saw another man, wearing a beard and hair of immoderate length; he raised

* *Missions du Levant*, tome iv. p. 88.

himself from the door of the tavern where he was seated and smoking, to salute us: 'That is my colleague,' said our guide; and we blushed for this second minister of the Lord. Poor Christians! it is a merit to you to preserve any principles of morality under such spiritual chiefs as these; and the contempt of the infidels, which they draw down upon your heads, is but the expiation and the consequence of their own faithlessness."

He proceeds on his journey and reaches Eregli, the ancient Heraclea. A Greek priest calls upon him, and he gladly seizes the opportunity of procuring aid in decyphering the inscriptions with which the neighbourhood abounds.

"But he sadly disconcerted our hopes, by saying that he was only lately raised to the priesthood, that his original calling was that of a goldsmith, and that his knowledge of the language of his fathers was limited to the power of reading it, without comprehending its sense. The other priest, to whom we were presented, was occupied with a grave affair. A cask of brandy had just arrived from Constantinople, which he was retailing with profit to his flock in the porch of the church. His first salutation was to offer me a large glass of it.....The vice of drunkenness, general and inveterate amongst the Greek race, has marked them with visible signs of degradation, which we at first erroneously attributed to their state of slavery."

One result of it is, that the Turks suppose their prophet to have prohibited the use of strong liquors on this very ground, because christians are always intoxicated. Throughout the journey the same scenes were renewed. At Castemouni, or Germanicopolis, a town in the centre of Paphlagonia: "We wished to sanctify the evening of Pentecost-day by a visit to our unfortunate Christian brethren. Their church presented a sad spectacle to our eyes. It was a subterraneous chamber, which threatened to fall in ruins upon the fir pillars which supported it, while the naked altar, covered with dust, attested still less the misery than the indifference of the flock. We searched in vain for their pastors; shame had made them fly, and they dared not appear before us. These people seem indeed to merit, by their moral degradation, the humiliating reproach of *Giaours*, or infidels; and the Turk is astonished when he hears them classed amongst the great family of the Christians of the west." More than once they confessed to M. Boré and his companions the true cause of their downfall. At Amasia he met two priests,

equally ignorant, but less degraded in their habits than the rest. "We were pleased to hear them acknowledge that the schism of their Church is the social cause of the ruin of the Greeks; that they are now expiating the offence of a criminal pride; and that re-union to the centre of Catholicity would restore to them science, moral force, and the hope of relief in their woes. It would suffice for the people to see the regularity of life and the learning of ministers modelled after the orthodox clergy of the west, to blush for their own priests, and to comprehend that they have lost the integrity of the faith." Finally, after completing the tour of Bithynia, Paphlagonia, Pontus, Cappadocia, and lesser Armenia, M. Boré thus sums up the results of his examination: "In these countries the Greeks seem only to vegetate, like a deplorable monument of the instability of human things. They live exposed to the contempt and persecutions of the Turks, and what is still more afflicting, they have preserved of Christianity nothing but the name. With what bitterness of heart have we not groaned over the state of their clergy, if we may honour with this name men married like the rest, as ignorant as them, since they do not even comprehend the prayers of the liturgy, and presenting no other mark of distinction than a beard and hair of extravagant length. We have seen them selling prayers to Turkish women, who came secretly to drink the waters of some miraculous fountain. We have seen also examples of divorces iniquitously authorized by the bishop for a sum of money. Rendered vile by such abuses, the clergy have lost the consideration necessary to them, and the little respect which the people publicly manifest towards them is a visible proof of it. We have seen them selling brandy at the door of their church, and converting, so to speak, the sanctuary into a tavern, before the eyes of the Mussulmen, justly disgusted at the profanation. Such miseries are a grave lesson for the Catholic who sees faith disappear and dissolution commence, in proportion as men become alienated from the centre of truth, which is the Roman Church."*

The late M. de Bonald remarks, in concluding his history of the Greek schism, that "there is nothing in the long-run so strong as truth, nothing so weak as error."†

* *Correspondance*, etc., tome i. pp. 153, et seqq.

† *L'état actuel de l'Europe*, § viii. tome iv. p. 261.

Our readers who have followed the above observations will probably be ready by this time to make the same reflection.

It is evident that since the Catholics of the east are for the most part of the same nations, and subject to the same exterior disadvantages as the heretics amongst whom they dwell, any social or moral superiority which they exhibit, must be attributed to the intrinsic force and invigorating principles of their holy religion. There is absolutely no other cause to which it can be referred. How great is their superiority, and in what it consists, shall be briefly shown.

Let us begin at Constantinople itself. M. Boré, to whose most interesting volumes we recommend the attention of our readers, has described the religious and social condition of the various classes which compose the heterogeneous population of this city. After depicting the almost incredible degradation of the schismatical Christians, of every sect, and especially of the clergy, who are contemned, even by their own flocks, he proceeds as follows: "The Catholic clergy, on the contrary, (whether Latin, Greek, or Armenian,) is surrounded with a holy dignity. When a priest enters a house, all the members of the family approach in succession to kiss his hand, which they then carry respectfully to their forehead. In general, this honour is justly paid to the merit and virtues of these men, who all observe celibacy, according to the custom of the western Church. The greater number of them visit Europe to study theology, and the principal languages spoken there."*

The contrast between the Catholic and schismatical clergy, of the same nation and language, is perhaps still more remarkable at a distance from the great cities. We have seen what the latter are,—married, ignorant, and brutal; yet on all sides of them are priests, whose political disadvantages are precisely the same as their own, but who are, nevertheless, worthy the following description: (it relates, let it be observed, not to men inhabiting the world's highways, but to the poor clergy buried in the centre of Armenia.) "Amongst the Catholic Armenian priests, those who have sufficient means, go to the capital of the Christian world to study theology and the other

* *Correspondance*, etc., tome i. p. 156.

ecclesiastical sciences. They generally possess a knowledge of Latin, and most commonly speak the Italian language. They are familiar with the best works on the canon law, and on questions of doctrine, morals, and controversy; and they are not strangers to the science of history, whether of the Church, or of the Christian monarchies of Europe." And the people whom they direct are not less elevated above their schismatical fellow-countrymen, who, mortified at their own immeasurable inferiority, endeavour to bribe the Turks, who are keen enough to detect the motive, to harass and oppress them. It is affecting to hear of the zeal and piety of these isolated brethren, whose virtues seem almost heroic when we consider their position and circumstances, or compare them with the fallen christians by whom they are surrounded.

But there is one other distinction between the Catholic and schismatical orientals, which, brief as our space is, we cannot omit to notice.

How much woman owes to Christianity, in the new honour and dignity with which it first invested her, is known to all. Mahometanism has again plunged her into slavery and shame, in all the countries where it prevails. The condition of women in the east is, then, a crucial test of the religious system and principles under which she lives. Now it is a prodigious fact, noticed by M. Boré, that "the schismatical Greeks and Armenians have caused their social system and their families to retrograde towards the Mussulman level. Their women fly from the sight of a *Franc* with a barbarism even more wild and senseless than that of the Turkish females." And in the very places, as at Constantinople, and generally throughout the east, where this extraordinary degradation of the schismatical families is witnessed, women of the *same* nation, far from sharing a bondage so barbarous and unchristian, will freely admit men, whose attachment to the Catholic religion is known, within the precincts of their dwellings, and permit the dignified freedom of intercourse which a common faith encourages and sanctifies. Let this striking and significant contrast, so honourable to our holy religion, and so characteristic of its beneficent and civilizing influence, conclude the details which it is impossible for us to pursue further in this place.*

* We should have been glad, if our space had permitted us to

And now it only remains to speak, in conclusion, of the Church of Russia.

Russia, which until the age of Peter I. was more an Asiatic than an European power, has never lost the form and shape into which she was first forcibly moulded and compressed by the iron hand of that extraordinary prince.

treat the subject adequately, to have examined in succession the striking testimony which each of the great cities of the East now presents, to the irresistible truth and power of the Catholic religion. We are tempted to add a very few words, in order to show how this might have been done.

The three most influential of these cities, and heretofore the strongholds of Mahometanism and heresy, are Constantinople, Smyrna, and Damascus. In the former the progress of the faith during the last seven years, is one of the most consoling events of modern times. In 1840, the Lazarist fathers gave education in their college to "the children of the most distinguished families in the city," and opened a school which soon numbered one hundred and fifty pupils, of all classes in society, and all influenced by enthusiastic attachment to their venerable masters. The sisters of charity received, in the first year of their residence, two hundred and thirty pupils, amongst whom were Arabs, Armenians, Russians, and Greek schismatics. The sultan himself subscribed two thousand five hundred francs to the works of mercy instituted by the sisters, and more than one of his pachas frequented M. Etienne's house, and openly testified their admiration and sympathy. The heretics themselves assisted with ardour at the religious offices, and heard the faith preached alternately in the Turkish, Greek, and French languages. M. Elluin catechises in Greek, every Sunday, three hundred children, and large numbers of adults. Finally, on Corpus Christi day, a public procession of the most Holy Sacrament took place, at which all classes assisted with respect and interest, and at which were present a band of musicians voluntarily offered for the occasion by one of the pachas! And this in the city of the sultan!

At Smyrna the progress of events is at least equally remarkable. Not long since it was impossible for a christian woman to gain admission to the house of a Turk. At the present day, not only are the sisters of charity eagerly sought for, but the Turkish mother presents her children to receive a blessing from them, and it is deemed a happy augury for the house into which these ministering angels enter. The Turks ask, "If the sisters descended in their present form from heaven?" And seeing that the heretics are utterly incapable of rivalling their devotion, and that their priests, as well as the Turkish *Imans*, solicit their services, they confound the Greeks with the Jews in a common contempt, and already begin to

Formed by the stupendous energy of his will, she is still ruled by the principles of that singular but subtle policy which he bequeathed to his successors, "*The Church of all the Russias*," to use the significant title by which the so-called *Holy Synod* has unconsciously revealed its real character, is at once the instrument and the creation of that policy. In Russia this fact is perfectly understood. It will not be long before Europe understands it too.

"The future of our national Church," exclaims the Count Gorousky, in a recent writing, "is the future of Russia." The admission is invaluable, and offers a clue by which all the windings of Russian diplomacy may be traced. To fuse all its existing tribes and dependencies, as well as those upon whose future subjection he is already speculating, into one vast Slavonic nation; and to preserve this formidable empire distinct and separate from all the great European families, not only by the control of a common political government, but chiefly, and above all, by the surer bond of a peculiar, local, and *national* religion; such is the vast scheme, partially disguised, yet from time to time all but avowed, of the autocrat of all the Russias.* If this scheme should ever be accomplished,—and how far the divine counsels may permit it to develop, does not belong to us to determine,—Europe may, perhaps, some day find, that "the north," of whose future destinies the sacred prophecies seem to speak so menacingly, has built up a power before which her combined forces will be shattered into fragments. But these considerations, however important to the general interests of mankind, are beside our present purpose. Perhaps too the growing elements of disunion already existing in Russia, and to which we shall have shortly to allude, may suffice to thwart the projects which she is secretly

examine the religion which alone is able to inspire such works. Aleppo, Damascus, Alexandria, and many other cities present the same phenomena; and the hour seems to be approaching when the children of the Arabian impostor, and the oppressed and fallen disciples of the oriental heresiarchs, will once more hear the voice of the true Shepherd, and be incorporated into the family of Jesus Christ.

* A Russian nobleman, who had learned by a long residence in Europe to compare the Catholic with the Slavonic religion, assured M. de Custine, that "the dominant thought of the Russian's mind is the triumph of *Greek orthodoxy*, the synonyme with them for *Russian policy*."—*La Russie en 1839, Lettre i. p. 88.*

forming, and to dissolve the strength and vigour upon the conservation of which their ultimate execution must obviously depend.

By the help of various publications, but exclusively of such as owe their authority to *personal* experience and examination, we shall now endeavour to present a brief outline of the actual state of Russia, considered in its relations to Religion and the Church. Our motive for entering upon this subject at the present time, has been already avowed.

We shall commence by frankly acknowledging that, in spite of the unfavourable antecedents of Russian ecclesiastical history, and the long subjection of the Russian Church to the savage caprices of barbarous autocrats, we could not divest ourselves, on first perusing the accounts of modern writers, of a certain suspicion of prejudice and exaggeration. It seemed scarcely credible that the humiliating picture which they draw of the Russo-Greek Church and its clergy, should be strictly accurate. If we have been compelled, after careful examination, to abandon this pleasing incredulity, it has been solely to the force of irresistible evidence that we have yielded. Much of that evidence is now derived from the highest authorities of the Russian Church, and from the documents published in the name of the "Holy Synod" itself. It agrees exactly with that of more impartial witnesses; or rather, it exceeds and surpasses even their most unfavourable testimony. Possevin, and the fathers of his order, De Tott and De Maistre, Rosaven and Theiner, and a multitude of others, have said nothing of the country and the religion, which they examined so closely, which has not been recently confirmed by the avowals of those who were at once best qualified to reveal their own secrets, and most interested in concealing them. It is by the aid of official documents and reports, bearing the subscription of the emperor or of his delegates, that Europe may now, without fear of error or injustice, pronounce judgment upon Russia and the Russian Church. We cannot, of course, hope to do more in this place than offer some assistance to those who desire, in a spirit of candour and charity, to form a true estimate of both. And, as we did not make the evidence, so we are not responsible for the conclusions which it may involve.

If we wished to test fairly the real character of a reli-

gious institution claiming the lofty titles which the Russo-Greek Church inscribes on its front, we should select perhaps such notes as the following: (1) Unity; (2) Catholicity; (3) Fecundity; (4) Holiness; (5) Liberty; (6) Learning. Let us apply, as briefly as possible, these several tests to the institution in question.

1. If there is a country in the world in which religious unity, the primary characteristic of the household of God, is utterly unknown, that country is Russia. In this respect it has even been compared with our own unfortunate England.

"England and Russia," says M. De Maistre, "may explain to themselves the number and the inexhaustible fecundity of the *sects* which are begotten within their vast bosom, by considering, that as the putrefaction of large organised bodies in nature engenders innumerable *sects* of filthy reptiles, so national religions which putrefy, produce a swarm of religious *insects*, which drag along the same soil the remains of a life divided, imperfect, and disgusting. The Russian Church, in particular, carries within its bosom more enemies than any other. 'Protestantism' penetrates it in every direction. *Raskolnicism* gathers strength every day; already its children may be counted by millions. There are certainly great differences between the sects of England and Russia, but the principle is the same. It is the *national religion* of which the life is ebbing away, while the *insects* appropriate it to themselves."

"There is no country in the world," said the emperor Nicholas to the Marquis de Custine, in 1839, "where there exists so great a diversity of races, of manners, of *religion*, and of mind, as in Russia. The diversity lies beneath the surface, where there is a uniformity which is merely superficial, and a unity which exists only in appearance." We shall find this candid avowal of the autocrat confirmed by other witnesses.

Theiner, whose important work owes perhaps its principal value to the documentary evidence of the so-called Holy Synod upon which it is founded, supplies many curious details on this subject.

"There is not a Church," says this writer, "which has been more torn in pieces and lacerated by heresy, than the 'orthodox' Russian Church. And as was the case in the ancient Greek Church, the greater part of Russian heresies have their origin in some convent. We may assert, without fear of deceiving ourselves, that nearly one-third of the schismatical Russian population is engaged in some sect. This gangrene of heresy extends from the Oural mountains to the Caspian Sea; from the regions of Siberia to the

sea of Azof and the Black Sea ; from whence, penetrating into the heart of the empire, it spreads and propagates itself in every direction. There is not a province, not a diocese, which is not infected with it, nor in which its roots are not deeply fixed. It is like a serpent which twines itself in numberless folds around the languishing body of the 'orthodox' Church, and daily injects into its bosom a mortal poison."*

This forcible description is accompanied by a relation of facts which will be best examined in the pages of the author. His observations upon the religious condition and sentiments of the vast population of *serfs*, are especially worthy of attention. "To these," he says, "the national church is an object of horror." And with good reason. For at the very time that the Roman Pontiffs were making vigorous efforts to discountenance and abolish slavery throughout the world, the Russian bishops were assisting their master, by servile edicts, to bind its heavy yoke upon the majority of his subjects. No wonder, if they appreciate at its true value the church which has never been to them more than a cruel and unnatural step-mother, and which, in the words of Theiner, "has no other doctrine to preach to them but to bow down the head under the chains which they wear, and to tremble at the imperial *knout*, the most eloquent missionary of orthodoxy."

But the persecutions which once dismayed the Russian *Raskolnik*, or separatist, are now in great measure suspended, and this for two reasons. The first, that the sectaries have become far too numerous to be coerced ; the second, that the policy of the Russian government is but little affected by their existence. "Why does not the Russian Church endeavour to recover the *Raskolniks*," asks the Russian counsellor of state, whose work is noticed at the head of this article, "since they are so evidently branches torn from the trunk of the dominant Church? It is because all the sects are *Russian* in language and in manners, and that therefore the *State* does not reckon upon making any political acquisition in procuring their return to its Church. It is, still more, because although they do not recognise the emperor as the spiritual chief of their sects, at least they acknowledge no other supremacy. For this reason they become tolerable in the eyes of a sovereign who is only resolved to permit within his empire

* *L'Eglise Schismatique Russe*, chap. ix. pp. 208, 209.

no other authority but his own." * For the same reason the Russian government is very complaisant both to its Armenian and Protestant subjects; the former of whom it calls "Gregorians," as if they were really of the same faith as the great Armenian apostle; and the latter "evangelicals," though in theory it considers and calls them little better than heathens. But neither of these religionists recognise any *external* supremacy. Hence their acceptableness with the autocrat. "There is nothing," says De Maistre, "so infallible as the instinct of impiety." The compliments of Robespierre to the French Protestants are another proof of it.

There was a time when the fault of rebellion against the national Church was less leniently dealt with. Peter made all the Raskolniks pay double taxes as the price of their religious insubordination. In 1730, when "the Russian Church appeared on the point of being ingulphed in an abyss of heresy, superstition, and impiety," a terrible *oukase* of the empress Anne ordained the penalty of capital punishment. Catherine II., more astute than her predecessors, and alarmed by the voluntary exile of 30,000 Raskolniks, resorted to milder measures. But in 1781, the greater part of the Kalmouks and the men of the Wolga, to the number of 120,000, emigrated from Russia, in order to enjoy their opinions with freedom. In 1714, under Peter the Great, 160,000 Tartars had placed themselves, with the same motive, under the Mussulman dominion of the Crimea. Finally, under Alexander, the principal sects were solemnly recognised by the State, and registers opened in the chief towns of the empire for the enrolment of all those who refused to belong to the national Church.

At the present time, about one-third of the whole population is infected with Raskolnicism. In 1838, "there were whole eparchies, especially those of the northern provinces, in which the greatest part of the inhabitants belonged to the various sects. *Whole convents were filled with monks sharing their principles.* M. Koeppen," a distinguished Russian functionary, and member of the Academy of Saint Petersbourg, reported to the government in 1839, "that in the single monastery of Danielow,

* *Persecution et Souffrances de l'Eglise Catholique en Russie*, 4ème, partie, p. 461.

at Olonetz, there were 235 *Raskolnik monks*." This report contains many other equally startling facts of the same kind, and enumerates hundreds of monks and nuns, belonging to various conventual houses, who made open profession of Raskolnicism.*

It would be tedious, perhaps impossible, to describe the great variety of sects which are ever multiplying within the vast extent of the Russian dominions. Some have fallen into Mahometanism; some, as Jules Klaproth relates, into a kind of Judaism.† Many are impure and infamous in their principles and habits. Whole districts are abandoned to *schamanism*, or the worship of the evil spirit. All are violently opposed to the "national church," against which they "protest," as it does against the Church of Rome. The government, which cannot hope any longer to reduce them to obedience, endeavours to conceal their formidable and growing numbers, and still talks pompously of "the orthodox Russian nation." All religious discussions are peremptorily forbidden. Sermons are only allowed on rare occasions, and in the great towns. This forced silence only augments the evil. "At every instant," says a Russian authority, "some peasant draws from the Bible a new heresy. When the 'pope' of the village discovers it, the heresy has already spread over the district,.....and as persuasion would only open the door to discussion, the worst of all evils in the eyes of an absolute government, they have recourse to silence, which hides the evil without healing it, or rather, does but encourage it. *It is by religious divisions that the Russian empire will perish.*"‡

II. The second note which it was proposed to consider, is that of Catholicity. It was by this test that an Augustine and an Optatus refuted the schismatical churches of Africa, even when they seemed to pride themselves most upon their numbers and extent. It will be equally effective in this case, and to the end of time.

* We are unwilling to repeat the descriptions of the discipline and moral character of the religious houses in Russia. Over such abominations it is better to draw a veil. M. de Custine's chapters on Moscow may be referred to by those who wish to know the whole truth.

† *Histoire des Sectes Religieuses*, par M. Gregoire, tome iii. p. 351.

‡ *La Russie en 1839, Lettre xxii. p. 134.*

It may appear a waste of words to discuss the catholicity of the schismatical Russian Church, since it does not so much as pretend to the possession of this divine note of the true spouse of Jesus Christ. The usual titles assumed by the various Photian sects are 'the Greek,' 'the orthodox,' and 'the oriental.' Yet, as De Maistre observes,

"These words, oriental church, or Greek church, have really no kind of meaning whatever. It is false that the Russian church belongs to the Greek. Where is the bond of co-ordination? What jurisdiction has the patriarch of Constantinople over the Russian priesthood? An archbishop sent by the emperor of Russia, is going at this moment, (1809,) to take possession of the archbishopric of Moldavia; the see of Constantinople will have nothing whatever to do with the matter; if to-morrow the Sultan should retake Moldavia, he would drive out the archbishop and introduce another. All these bishops, thus independent of a common authority, and strangers one to another, the miserable puppets of the temporal power which deals with them as with its soldiers, discern perfectly in their own hearts what they are,—that is, nothing. And how should we esteem them higher than they esteem themselves?"*

But Russia is not content to be herself, "in all ages," independent of Constantinople, she wishes others to be independent of it too. "The new kingdom of Greece, *in imitation, and by the counsels of Russia*, has withdrawn itself from obedience to the patriarch of Constantinople, and has placed its clergy under the direction of a synod, subject only to the absolute supremacy of the political power. It is the frog which tries to imitate the bull."†

The fallen prelate of Byzantium must now console himself with the empty sound of the puerile and preposterous titles in which his predecessors delighted, and which, by an appropriate judgment, are now all that remains to their successor. It seems almost in studied derision that the Russians and Greeks still call him, "the most holy, most

* De Maistre, *Lettre à une Dame Russe, sur le Schisme et sur l'Unité Catholique*.

† "An event which, in the Catholic Church, would have occasioned the remonstrances of the Holy See, and great troubles of conscience amongst a Catholic population, was accomplished in Greece without a shock, and even without a rumour. So feeble is the tie which attaches to the pretended chief of the oriental Church the Churches most contiguous to him, even those of which the bishops were his suffragans!"—*Persecution de l'Eglise Catholique en Russie*, p. 386.

orthodox, and oecumenical archpastor of the East, etc. etc." "*Servus servorum Dei*" has a better sound to Christian ears. But the Greeks were always skilled in words, and when they have nothing else to give, this is the cheap coin which they dispense.

It is evident, then, that the Churches of Constantinople, Athens, and Moscow, which can hardly pretend to Catholicity *singly*, and which, even if closely united, would only form a sect with fewer bishops than the Donatists alone possessed, are in fact perfectly distinct from each other. "It is common," says the illustrious writer already quoted, "to confound in conversation the Russian and the Greek Church. Nothing, however, is more evidently false. There is no Greek Church *out of Greece*; and that of Russia is no more Greek than it is Coptic or Armenian. It is alone in the Christian world, not more alienated from the Pope whom it disowns, than from the separated Greek patriarch, who would pass for a madman if he took it into his head to send to Saint Petersbourg an order of any sort or kind whatsoever. The very shadow of all religious co-ordination has disappeared from the Russians together with their patriarch. The church of this great people, entirely isolated, possesses no longer even a spiritual chief to whom ecclesiastical history may give a name."

The Russian Church, then, does not possess even so faint a pretence to catholicity as it might derive from connection with the separated communities of other countries. We have seen also that millions, within its own territory, and once numbered amongst its members, have already escaped, and are daily slipping away, from its feeble grasp. It remains to show, in order to comprehend what claims it has to the inalienable titles of the Catholic Church, that, far from accompanying the latter, either as a rival or as an auxiliary, in the silent ceaseless march wherewith she daily traverses the earth, treading the shores of every far-off sea, and mounting the courses of every river and stream, and penetrating to the remotest East and West in search of new families or tribes to whom her awful message may be delivered, this "posthumous offspring of the Byzantine revolt," palsied and impotent from its birth, leaves its own famished children to starve in their icy wastes, without the possibility of practising their nominal religion, or even the hope of being able to do so at some future and more auspicious epoch.

In the year 1836, the president of the *Synod* made the following official report, which will serve to show that if the Russian Church does nothing to propagate the Christian faith in other lands, she does but little more to perpetuate it in her own. "There are now wanting," says the Report, "2831 priests, 2263 deacons, and 11,212 inferior clergy; in all, 16,306 persons. This deficiency, *which augments every day in all the eparchies*, makes itself felt in some in a manner which is only too sensible. In the eparchy of Catherinoslaw, there are deficient 285 priests; in that of Smolensk, 198; in that of Kiew, as many as 2,037!" After further particulars equally discouraging, the Report proceeds as follows. "The number of vacant parishes is so great in some eparchies, that it has been impossible for the faithful to accomplish their religious duties." We refer our readers to the sixth chapter of Theiner's work, where they will find the most accurate information, entirely founded upon official documents, upon the state of the Russian Church within its own territories, and in relation to its own members.

Lastly, if the Russian Church has herself no pretence to the glorious title of Catholic, she manifests, by a systematic persecution, which for savage unrelenting cruelty was scarcely surpassed even in the Tiberian age, her instinctive recognition of the only body to which that title really belongs. "There are in this capital," says one who long dwelt in Saint Petersburg, "preachers of the Armenian, Anglican, Lutheran, and Calvinistic creeds, far more hostile to the faith of the country than ourselves. Who ever troubles himself about what these men say? It is far otherwise with respect to the Catholics. *They* cannot utter a word, nor make a step, which does not become the subject of an examination, a criticism, or a precaution. For every false religion knows that its only real enemy is the true one."*

"There is a great and magnificent city," says the same writer, and with these words we conclude, "which presents the opportunity of an interesting experiment which I propose to all thoughtful men. Within a space of no great extent it contains Churches of all the Christian communities. There may be seen a Catholic church, a Russian church, an Armenian church, a Calvinistic church, a Lutheran church; a little farther on is an Anglican church;

* De Maistre,

there is only wanting, I think, a *Greek Church*. Say, then, to the first man whom you happen to meet, 'Show me the *orthodox church*.' Each Christian will point out to you *his own*; a great proof already of a common *orthodoxy*. But say, 'Show me the *Catholic church*.' All will reply, 'That is it!' and all will show you the same. Great and profound subject of meditation! *She alone has a name upon which all the world are agreed!*"*

(3.) If the Church of Russia has neither *unity* nor *catholicity*, her separation from the source of life and strength is not less strongly marked by the absence of even the slightest token or movement of *fecundity*. We shall see that the policy of her rulers has led them not only to neglect, but even in some cases formally to oppose, the conversion of unbelievers. And far from denying a sterility which is demonstrated by every page of Russian history, M. de Maistre reports that, during his residence in Saint Petersbourg, he had "even heard them pride themselves upon this sterility." Such a boast depicts the true character of the Russian religion better than a thousand arguments. It contains at once the avowal and the condemnation of a system which, by their own showing, is purely exclusive, national, and political, and which confessedly aims at no higher object than the official patronage of a *local* religion in aid and support of a *local* policy.

"The lamentable spectacle of whole provinces severed violently from its communion by the heresy of its own pastors," says Theiner, "or subjugated by Mahometanism, and the double loss of the holy sepulchre, fallen a second time, by Greek perfidy, into the power of the Mussulmans, such are the deplorable events which disclose the whole mystery of the mission of the 'oriental' Church." And the history of the Russian is not more honourable. "Not only," says the same writer, "has she not ran to distant places to carry the faith to the Gentiles; she has not even condescended to occupy herself with those who dwell on her own soil.....It is to the Russian Church that we must attribute the disgrace which attaches to Christian Europe, in seeing still in the 19th century so many pagans within her bosom. *Whole provinces, in effect, united to the Russian empire during many ages, are still filled with Gentiles.*" And as she has neither the will nor the power to convert them herself, so she casts obstacles in the way

* *Du Pape*, liv. iv. chap. 5. tome ii. p. 194.

of those who possess both. "The Russians," says Gibbon, "refused a passage to the missionaries of Rome, who aspired to convert the Pagans beyond the Tanais."* At the present day they continue this hateful mission. In the latter half of the 17th century, the Jesuit fathers, assuming the glorious functions which the Byzantine clergy were unequal to discharge, succeeded in converting many thousands of Armenians and other heretics. The Russian government, solicitous only to mar the holy works which it cannot rival, "forbids the priests to give any instruction to the Armenians who have passed into its territory, interdicts the approach of every foreign ecclesiastic,"† and thus attempts to root out the faith which others planted. *Est qui quærat et judicet!* ‡

The violence with which Russia opposes the attempts of others to evangelize her unconverted subjects, is sometimes employed against those very subjects, with an Asiatic inconsistency, when her policy seems to require it. Thus in 1837, the government was obliged to check the indiscriminate ferocity with which the formidable *knout* had been used by the priests whom she had sent amongst the Kalmouks; while in 1838, the tribe of the Bouriates, amounting to 150,000 men, besides women and children, whom she had vainly endeavoured, by the same singular mode of persuasion, to reduce to the Slavonic uniformity, decided indeed to change their religion, but instead of Buddhists, which they had been before, became followers of the Grand Lama! Even when they do succeed, by promises or presents, in withdrawing a Pagan from idolatry, "it is very rare that he does not speedily return to his old worship. The celebrated Theophanes Procopovitch, archbishop of Resau, relates that he had met a baptized Jew, who only knew of the Christian doctrine the single word *catechumen*, which he had been taught by the missionary.

* Quoted by Mr. Renouf,

† *Correspondance et Mémoires d'un Voyageur en Orient*, tome i. p. 401.

‡ Unhappily the Russians can quote the example of England, whose cruisers once covered the seas in pursuit of Catholic missionaries, in mitigation of their guilt. In the single year 1590, more than twenty thousand persons suffered death for religion in Japan; and the English and Dutch urged the barbarians to new cruelties, and more refined tortures!—See the *Histoire de la Compagnie de Jesus*, par M. Cretineau-Joly, tome iii. chap. 3, p. 185.

The celebrated Father Rosaven, of the Company of Jesus, knew equally, during the long stay which he made in Russia, a baptized Turk, to whom the 'pope' had forgotten to teach that he ought not to honour Mahomet as much as Jesus Christ."* Similar avowals appear in the reports of the supreme procurer of the "Holy Synod," for the years 1837 and 1838. The revelations which they contain of the character of Russian "converts," would be ludicrous if the subject were less grave and momentous. A little while since, the government used to bribe its Tartar subjects with the present of a pelisse, and other vestments; but as thousands of these Pagans presented themselves at the beginning of winter to be received into the "national church," and long before the spring "had returned to their gods as before," this expensive mode of conversion was abandoned. Their names, however, figure in the mendacious reports of the "Holy Synod," and in the catalogue of apostolical works which, it very well knows, remain still to be accomplished. †

With one additional illustration of the character of the Russian Church, in this particular, we must conclude.

"The sterile Church of Russia," says one who knows well her multiplied misdeeds, "does not even know how to convert to the faith her own numerous populations of Mussulmen and Pagans. But not only do the Russian government and its slave, the Synod, remain perfectly indifferent to the sad destiny of so many souls perishing in ignorance; the former *opposes itself systematically and by policy to their conversion to Christianity*. The emperor has formed and taken into his pay several squadrons of cavalry, drawn from the populations of the Caucasus.....All these men are Mahometans: they live in the midst of a Christian capital, where they have mosques constructed and ornamented at the expense of the treasury. Many children also from the countries of the Caucasus are brought to Saint Petersburg, and there receive a gratuitous education. But it is most rigorously forbidden to admit them to the Christian instruction of their companions, or to attendance at their church. You may often see them weep and lament that they cannot become

* Theiner, chap. xii. p. 319.

† Laurent Lange, who was sent on a mission from St. Petersburg to China, in 1715, after relating the "conversion" of a tribe who were baptized by the order of Prince Gargarin, adds, "but they have not the slightest conception of the difference between christianity and paganism."—*Journal du Voyage à la Chine*, p. 93. Cf. *Nouveaux Mémoires de la Moscovie*, tome i. p. 193, (1716.)

Christians, but the order is inflexible; they must remain what they are. Why? Because these children are destined to return one day to their native country, where their part will be to preach to their compatriots the advantages which they may derive from absolute and irrevocable submission to Russia. And the 'most holy and most orthodox Synod' has no remonstrances to make upon measures so cruel! *Dominus horum vindex est!*"*

It would be an affront to our readers if we were to contrast with the revolting and voluntary sterility of this unnatural Church, the divine fecundity of the Church of Rome. "What grounds of comparison are there," asks M. de Maistre, "when there is *all* on one side, and *nothing* on the other?"

(4.) It has been remarked that Zondras, the Greek annalist, who speaks of Ignatius as a 'saint,' though he was preferred by the Holy See to Photius, does not give that title to any other patriarch of Constantinople, from the time of Ignatius down to the termination of his own annals. The succession of saints ended when the schism began, and holiness has for centuries ceased to be a note of the Greek or oriental sects. What claim the Russian Church has to this supernatural gift, a few facts will sufficiently disclose.

We shall begin with the clergy.—All the writers, of every nation and creed, with whom we are acquainted, are unanimous on one point; all declare, *unâ voce*, that to appreciate, or even to imagine, the moral and social degradation of the Russian clergy, it is necessary to have lived amongst them.† The very proverbs which are current in Russian society, of every class, and which are heard in Russia alone, reveal their true character. "*Son of a priest*," is the last insult to which a man has recourse in reviling an enemy. "Am I a 'pope,' that I should eat twice?" is the disdainful allusion to the habits of the half-famished clergy. "Like pastor, like flock," is the comment upon the irregularities of laymen. And these are only specimens. Like the fallen priesthood of Syria and Armenia, the chief characteristics of the Russian clergy

* *Persecution et Souffrances de l'Eglise Catholique en Russie, Notes Additionnelles*, p. 519.

† M. de Maistre, than whom no one was better qualified to describe them, declares repeatedly that any adequate account of their real condition would appear incredible to those who had not actually witnessed it.

appear to be habitual drunkenness, profound ignorance, and the lowest habits of a sordid and animal existence. "The vice of drunkenness is so common amongst them," says Theiner, "that it excites no observation." In the ships of the navy, he adds, where they receive always an increase of salary, "the commanders usually place the chaplain under arrest for twenty-four hours before divine service, to make sure that he will not present himself drunk at the altar." Their general character may be gathered from the official and annual "Reports" of the "Holy Synod" itself. In the Report for 1836, it appears that, during that single year, *one in fifty* of the whole Russian clergy was under condemnation by the public sentence of the various tribunals. Since that period the moral state of the clergy, if we may believe the reluctant testimony of the Synod, has steadily deteriorated. Thus in 1837, comparing the number of condemnations with the total number of clergy, it appears that these amounted for the whole empire to *one in twenty-four*! in 1838, to *one in twenty-three*; and in 1839, to *one in twenty*! In the four years, from 1836 to 1839, the Synod reports that 15,443, or *one-sixth* of the 102,456 ecclesiastics of every rank and grade, were under judgment, and that as the supreme procurator himself declares, "*for infamous crimes!*"*

The number of criminals is still more frightful, when considered in relation to particular dioceses. Thus, in the eparchy of Wiatka, the Synod was compelled to announce the appalling fact, that *one-ninth* of all the clergy were under judgment; in that of Kasan and Orel, one-tenth; in that of Tchernigow, one-thirteenth; in that of Kiew, one-fourteenth; in that of Novoscherkask, one-fifteenth; in that of Novogorod, one-twentieth; and finally, in that of Moscow, one-twenty-sixth. The educated population, especially at Saint Petersburg, "were struck with stupor on learning that in the course of a single year, 1836, two-hundred and eight priests had been *degraded*." The government endeavoured to account for these horrors in the following year, by "the want of seminaries, and the little instruction of our clergy, which in this respect is still in its infancy."†

All writers agree that the *people* of Russia are in their

* *L'Eglise Schismatique Russe*, chap. vi. p. 138

† *Ibid*, p. 139.

nature profoundly religious. The rigid exactness with which they still observe certain exterior forms, and the respect which they manifest for the very priest when ministering at the altar, whom at other times they regard with contempt or abhorrence, are proofs of this disposition. But with such guides their religion has ceased, for the most part, to be more than a superstitious pharisaical devotion, which neither checks nor condemns a life of habitual transgression against the most elementary precepts of the evangelical law. "The Russians," says M. de Bonald, "have a religion entirely composed of words, ceremonies, legends, and abstinences, which is to genuine Christianity nearly what the Judaism of the Rabbis, followed by modern Jews, is to the Mosaic worship."*

"I have seen in Russia," says a profound and acute observer, "a Christian church, which nobody attacks, which all the world respects, at least in appearance; a church which every thing favours in the exercise of its moral authority, and yet this church is wholly powerless over the hearts of men; she can create only hypocrisy or superstition."†

"In the Russian Church," says another writer, and this fact is too important to be omitted, "*frequent communion* is entirely unknown; to such an extent that even the most regular persons rarely communicate more than once in the year, at the paschal season."‡ This fact would suffice alone to indicate the state of religion in Russia. All persons who have but commenced the religious life will comprehend its full meaning. We need not contrast it with the happier experience of Catholics. We should not err in saying that, at least in many parts of the Church, communion once a week is not considered "*frequent*." We have ourselves habitually frequented churches in England and France, not to speak of other countries, in which large numbers of the faithful communicated at least every week; many three, four, or five times; and we have known not a few privileged souls who approached the holy table every day of the year. Yet in Russia, the Synod relates that even of the clerical class, 1412 persons neglected, in a single year, to communicate even once! What is the

* *Legislation Primitive*, tome iv. p. 176.

† *La Russie en 1839*, Lettre xxxvi. p. 179.

‡ *Persecution et Souffrances de l'Eglise Catholique en Russie*, p. 326.

habit of the laity in this respect, may be concluded from the fact that, to say nothing of those who took no part *whatever* in the paschal duties, there were in the same year, by the report of the Synod, 2,136,830 persons who confessed, but did *not* communicate,—that is to say, upwards of two million Christians, who evidently had some sense of their religious responsibilities, since they approached the sacrament of penance, and yet did *not* perform, once in the year, the most elementary obligation of the Christian life.*

(5.) To prove that the Church of Russia has no share in "the glorious *liberty* of the children of God," it is only necessary to point to her history and constitution. Liberty, whether civil or religious, for which the rest of mankind are willing to contend even to death, is a boon which the Russian does not even desire, and which, as the autocrat not untruly assured M. de Custine, he would not know how to use. The Church of Russia perfectly comprehends her mission, and fulfils it. "To obey, to make others obey, and to keep silence," says a modern writer, "such is the sole function of a Russian bishop."

When Peter the Great abolished the Patriarchate, and with it every feature of a Church, he did not even soothe the outrage by any delusive affectation of pity or regret. His language was like that which Elizabeth addressed to the fallen bishops of England.† "I recognise," said he, when humbly solicited to restore the patriarchal dignity, "no other legitimate patriarch but the Bishop of Rome." Then, placing one hand on the hilt of his sword, and the other on the Gospels, he added: "Since you will not obey *him*, you shall obey me alone. Behold your patriarch!"†

* The writer last quoted says, p. 327, "I have seen with my own eyes an old soldier performing the office of clerk, and bringing in, in the folds of his coat, fragments of bread, which the priest placed in the chalice (unconsecrated), in order to distribute during the communion."

† "All which, if you, my lords of the clergy, do not amend, I mean to depose you;" was one of her gentle admonitions. And they had to bear harder words than these. See D'Ewes' *Journals of Queen Elizabeth*; Rushworth's *Historical Collections*, vol. ix. p. 328.

‡ Theiner, p. 46. The venal patriarchs of Constantinople and Antioch degraded themselves so far as to style Peter, in spite of his infamous life and atrocious murders, the "*holy* autocrat, the most pious Czar of all the Russias."—p. 49.

From that time the Czars have adopted as their device the haughty words of their great predecessor, and there is not probably a Russian within the empire who so much as thinks of disputing them. The sultan at Constantinople, and the autocrat at Saint Petersburg, such are the rulers to whom they must now submit, who once rejected the government of the Vicar of Christ.

One who has traversed their whole empire, and scrutinized all their institutions, thus describes their last end.

"The sacrifice is consummated; the Russian priest, impoverished, humiliated, degraded, married, deprived of his supreme chief in the spiritual order, despoiled of all influence, of all supernatural power, a man of flesh and blood, drags himself after the triumphal chariot of his enemy whom he still calls his master; he has become what that master designed him to be, the humblest of the slaves of the autocracy. Thanks to the perseverance of Peter I. and Catherine II., Iwan IV. is contented. Henceforth, from one end of Russia to the other, one is sure that the voice of God will no more overpower the voice of the emperor. Such is the inevitable abyss into which at least all *national churches* must fall."*

The only semblance of ecclesiastical authority in Russia, is that which resides in the Synod. But the Synod has for its *president*, and supreme director, an aid-de-camp of the emperor; a nobleman of considerable personal merit, but whose office is simply to represent and execute the will from which there is no appeal. "Every one makes the law in the Synod and by the Synod, except the dignitaries of the church who belong to it. These decide nothing, ordain nothing."† They have merely to do what they are commanded to do, and they know it. We have before us the Synodal reports of several consecutive years. Every thing is openly enjoined, executed, and confirmed, by "*the supreme will of his majesty*." The most delicate points of ecclesiastical law receive their solution from *him*, and be his decision what it may, the Synod has neither advice nor remonstrance to offer.‡ It is a company for

* De Custine, *Lettre* xxvi. p. 86.

† Theiner, p. 53.

‡ "The emperor Nicholas has quite recently abolished several degrees of consanguinity or affinity, hitherto regarded as *immovable impediments* to marriage, in the Russian Church, without one of her prelates daring to address to him the slightest remonstrance upon

registering imperial edicts, communicated to it by a colonel of hussars. An anecdote will show how far those edicts may be slighted with impunity. A bishop of a southern province, who had given some offence, was lately cited to Saint Petersburg. He pleaded his great age, and the rigour of the winter. The answer was an imperial order to exchange his bishopric, situated in a temperate climate, for that of Kursk, in the centre of Siberia; and this, as it was added with a bitter irony, "in order to accustom him to a climate so excellent for health and old age." The autocrat, whose great qualities only demanded a less perilous position to have taken a happier development, has been seen, even during the solemn offices, to reprimand some fault in the celebrants, or to take in his own hands the censer, to show some inexperienced thurifer how to incense the images of the saints. The ecclesiastical regulations published by Peter in 1721, had prepared the way for all this, and a great deal more. In the "instructions for the clergy," they are directed to "condemn publicly all connivance with the Raskolniks, and to swear fidelity to the emperor in consenting to *reveal* all which could be injurious to his majesty, *even the secrets of the confessional*."* It is not necessary to add that the social misery of these priests is as galling as their ecclesiastical bondage. In 1837, the whole sum allotted for their maintenance, if divided by the number of the clergy, would give 77 francs, or barely three pounds sterling a head. No wonder that a 'pope' "eats twice," according to the proverb, when he can do so. "The abjection of this priesthood," says M. de Maistre, "cannot be conceived by one who has not been a witness of it." "There is not in Christendom," adds Theiner, "a more miserable race of men upon the earth. There is not one oppressed to the same point, nor plunged into the same degree of contempt. We will even confess, that amongst the Turks themselves,

this alteration of the ancient discipline. *Pet. S. de l'Eglise Cath. en Russie, introduction*, p. 18. The yearly official *Reports* contain many similar examples; thus, in the Report of 1837, we read: "By an injunction of the council of the empire, confirmed by his majesty, the marriage of a pagan with a Mussulman woman has been declared *valid and legal*, when the latter suffers herself to be baptized afterwards." See other specimens in Theiner's third chapter.

* Theiner, p. 222.

amongst the idolaters of China or of India, never dervish, bonze, or faquir has been so outraged, so barbarously maltreated, as is the clergy of this country by 'the most orthodox' government of Russia."

(6.) It may be anticipated, from what has gone before, that *learning* is not an attribute of the Russian Church, any more than unity, catholicity, fecundity, holiness, or freedom.

"What luminaries in every branch of learning," exclaims Cozius, "did the ancient Greek Church produce! But now, from about the year 1000, when they began more openly to recede from us, hardly will you find through a period of six hundred years, a single name which deserves the praise of excellence in any good art. Gregorius relates that there was not in the whole Greek empire, a man who was able to dispute with ours in divine things, and scarcely one who was even moderately learned. If any one desires to add to his science, he sets forth from Constantinople to Rome, and seeks the college which Gregory XIII. erected for the instruction of the Greeks. Why has not the great Duke of the Muscovites done the same things for his Greeks?.....There is nothing which so powerfully aids the investigation of truth as philosophy rightly understood. On this account the evil spirit, that he might involve the Greeks in the most profound darkness of ignorance, has effected that their bishops should be chosen from the monks, and the monks remain almost necessarily destitute of learning, that they might be dispossessed of this chief instrument in the perception of truth."*

Jeremy of Constantinople showed an accurate appreciation of the science of the Muscovite clergy, when he recommended them, in 1723, not to answer "the questions proposed by the inhabitants of Great Britain," and "never to enter into discussion with *those English*."† It is the

* *De Signis Eccles.* lib. xii. cap. 12. The last Greek savans, as Bessarion, Allatius, Arcudius, and others, were all attached to the holy See. Since the disputes which the confession of Cyril Lucar produced, the Greeks have had recourse, on many occasions, to the works of Cardinal Bellarmine, to refute the opinions of Lutherans and Calvinists. Vide *Perpétuité de la Foi*, liv. v. chap. 6. tome. iv. p. 393.

† Theiner. Not only at the present day, but during the last two centuries, the Greeks have acknowledged, by their acts, their own incapacity. In the eighteenth century, their prelates repeatedly committed the instruction of their flocks to the Catholic missionaries of the East. *Missions du Levant*, tome. iv. p. 89. "The Greeks themselves regarded them as the only instructors of youth, and sent their children to be educated by them, together

same prudential motive which prompts the government to retain always in the capital a few men superior to the rest of their order, with the double motive of passing them off upon foreigners as only an average specimen of their class, and of avoiding the reproaches which the gross ignorance of the majority of the clergy would be sure to provoke. "There is not a Christian nation, however insignificant it may be, whose sacred literature does not cast into the shade that of the immense populations of the *holy* Russia. Nicolas Novikow, interpreter to the Holy Synod, and the metropolitan Eugenius Bulgari, inform us, that this church, which has existed nearly ten ages, has not begotten more than 213 writers!" And even of many of these the works are utterly insignificant. Moreover, "two-thirds of the ecclesiastical writers of the Russian Church are *foreigners*. Only *ninety-four* amongst them belong to their own nation, and all these either received their education abroad, or at the hands of some foreigner."* It would be obviously absurd to discuss the *learning* of such a nation as this.

But Russia, or rather the Russian government, in asserting its pretensions to every other possession of Western Europe, wishes to claim that of learning also. "Russia," exclaims M. de Custine, indignant at the fraud and hypocrisy which encountered him at every turn, "is the empire of *catalogues*; to read as a collection of titles, it is magnificent; but take care that you don't search further. If you open the book, you will find nothing in it which the titles announce. All the chapters are marked, but they are all still to be written.....the very nation itself is as yet only an advertisement, placarded in the face of Europe, the

with those of the Europeans and Armenians." *Histoire de la Compagnie de Jesus*, tome v. chap. i. p. 9. They do the same thing now even in Constantinople. And in Russia itself, before the present policy of that empire was developed, and as it has been by the reigning emperor, Alexander, at the beginning of the present century, pursuing the plans of his predecessors, Catherine and Paul, entrusted to Jesuits the difficult task of "preparing unity amongst the heterogeneous colonists of Saratof, on the banks of the Wolga, and still later at Odessa and Astrakhan." *Ibid*, chap. vii. p. 508. Paul I. encouraged the spread of Catholicism designedly: "Comme le plus formidable rampart entre les desordres de l'intelligence et les revoltes de l'esprit." p. 498.

* *L'Eglise Schismatique Russe*, chap. xi. p. 260.

dupe of a diplomatic fiction." When Catherine II. published her vast project of national education,—according to which all the sciences, all languages, and all knowledge, were to be taught at once in all the corners of the empire,—and caused this stupendous scheme to be translated and circulated all over Europe; "we may be sure," says Theiner, "that in reading the panegyrics which such a stage-trick secured for her, she could not restrain the inextinguishable laughter which her success provoked. We have the proof of it in a letter written by her, to the governor of Moscow, one of her former paramours. She said to him: 'My dear prince, do not grieve if our Russians have no desire for instruction, and if the order to erect schools in my empire was made *not for us, but for Europe*, and to perpetuate amongst foreigners the good opinion which they have of us. For from the moment that the Russian people shall have seriously commenced to instruct themselves, I shall no longer continue empress, nor you governor of Moscow.'

It is the same system of deceit and imposture which still rules in Russia, and according to which all the clergy have lately been ordered to possess themselves of a certain "religious code," printed in 1838, though the government knows perfectly well that they neither can nor will procure it, and that they could not comprehend it if they did. "Like the oukases of Peter, of Catherine, or of Nicolas; like the gigantic creations of schools; like the pompous relations of the Synod, of which almost the whole reality reposes upon the indignation of the authors; like all those juggleries without number, with which the Russian government has amused Europe during a century and a half; this magnificent work of ecclesiastical instruction is nothing but a handful of dust to be thrown in the eyes of idle or curious bystanders."* It is not to promote learning, but to perpetuate ignorance, that the rulers of Russia direct all their efforts; for they know that with knowledge comes freedom, and that freedom would inspire war with a cruel and oppressive government, and peace and reconciliation with the Catholic Church.

The great length to which this article has unavoidably extended does not permit us to prolong it still further by reflections which, if we are not deceived, will offer them-

* *Ibid*, chap. xi. p. 298.

selves spontaneously to every mind. We are not insensible of the disadvantage of considering, within the narrow compass of a Review, a subject upon which many volumes have been written, and for the due appreciation of which much study and examination is imperatively required. Enough perhaps has been said to give an adequate idea of the real character of the Greek schism, and to justify the proposition with which we commenced,—“that the separated Greek Church, far from being ‘a witness against the Church of Rome,’ offers a more complete, effective, and irresistible testimony in proof both of her claims and doctrines, than all other institutions whatsoever.” But it is necessary to have weighed carefully, not merely such fragments of evidence as our scanty space has enabled us to present, but the whole history of the Russian and oriental sects, especially during the last two centuries, in order to comprehend fully the grave lessons which that history involves. Whoever has not done this, though he may arrive at the most accurate general conclusions, and easily distinguish between the true mother of the faithful, and those who affect or usurp her titles, will not have a just impression either of the profound degradation of the schismatical communities, or of the immutability of God’s promises to His Church. There is an observation of Saint Augustine, and with this we conclude, of the truth of which the history of the followers of Photius and Michael Cerularius affords one of the most striking illustrations. He is noticing how the efforts of her various enemies, and even their very existence, serve only to promote the glory of the Church, and he adds: “*Utitur enim gentibus ad materiam operationis suæ; hæreticis ad probationem doctrinæ suæ; schismaticis ad documentum stabilitatis suæ; Judæis ad comparisonem pulchritudinis suæ.*” * Let any one, who possesses the necessary qualifications, compare, according to this suggestion of St. Augustine, the respective histories of the Catholic Church and of the various dissident communities; and we are persuaded that he will find, if hitherto he has been attached to the latter, only a new and affecting admonition to return to Unity; and if he have the happiness to be already a member of the former, a fresh motive for repeating once more that song of praise and thanksgiving which it belongs only

* *De Vera Religione*, cap. vi. opp. tom. i. p. 302. Paris, 1586.

to the faithful to utter: "Lauda, Jerusalem, Dominum; lauda Deum tuum, Sion: Quoniam confortavit seras portarum tuarum, benedixit filiis tuis in te."

-
- ART. VIII.—1. *Ecclesiastical Antiquities of Down, Connor, and Dromore*, consisting of a Taxation of those Dioceses compiled in the year MCCCVI. with notes and illustrations. By the Rev. WILLIAM REEVES, M.B.M.R.I.A., perpetual curate of Kilcouriola, in the diocese of Connor. Dublin, Hodges & Smyth, 1847.
2. *Leabhar na g-ceart, or the Book of Rights*. Now for the first time edited, with translation and notes, by John O'Donovan, Esq., M.R.I.A., Barrister at Law. Dublin, printed for the Celtic Society, 1847.
3. Publications of the Irish Archæological Society, namely,
- 1.—*The Circuit of Ireland*, by Muircheartach Mac Neill, Prince of Arleach; a Poem written in the year 1442, by Cormacan Eigeas, chief poet of the north of Ireland, now for the first time printed, with a Translation and Notes by John O'Donovan, Esq. Dublin, 1841.
- 2.—*The Banquet of Dun Na N—Gedh, and the Battle of Magh Rath*: an ancient historical tale, from a manuscript in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin, with a Translation and Notes by John O'Donovan, Esq. Dublin, 1842.
- 3.—*A Treatise of Ireland*, by John Dymock, from a manuscript in the British Museum, with Notes by the Rev. Richard Butler, A.B.M.R.I.A. Dublin, 1842.
- 4.—*Jacobi Grace Kilkenniensis Annales Hiberniæ*, edited with a Translation and Notes, by the Rev. R. Butler. Dublin, 1842.
- 5.—*The Tribes and Customs of Hy-Many, commonly called O'Kelly's Country*, with a Translation and Notes, and a Map of Hy-Many, by John O'Donovan. Dublin, 1843.
- 6.—*The Genealogies, Tribes, and Customs, of Hy-Fiachrach, commonly called O'Dowda's Country*, now first published, with a Translation and Notes, and a Map of Hy-Fiachrach, by John O'Donovan. Dublin, 1844.
- 7.—*The Book of Obits and Martyrology of the Cathedral Church of the Holy Trinity, commonly called Christ Church, Dublin*: edited from the original manuscript in Trinity College, Dublin, by John Clarke Crosthworthe, A.M., with an introduction, by James Henthorn Todd, DD., V.P.R.I.A., F.T.C.D. Dublin, 1844.
- 8.—*Registrum Prioratus omium Sanctorum Juxta, Dublin*, edited from a manuscript in T. C. D., with Additions and Notes by the Rev. Richard Butler. Dublin, 1845.

- 9.—*A Chorographical Description of West or H-Iar, Conn ught*, written A.D. 1684, by Roderick O'Flaherty, Esq., author of the *Ogygia*, edited from a manuscript in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin, with Notes by James Hardiman, M.R.I.A. Dublin, 1846.
- 10.—*The Miscellany of the Irish Archæological Society*, Dublin, 1846, containing a Poem attributed to St. Columbkille, with a Translation and Notes by J. O'Donovan, and many other interesting papers.

THE first thing which must strike the most superficial reader of the catalogue of publications which we have placed at the head of this article, is the immense impulse which has been given within the last few years, to the study of Irish History. The investigation of our ancient annals, has at length engaged the attention of men of all parties, and united them in the pursuit of one common object. By a species of miracle, party feuds and religious animosities have been forgotten, and the rank and wealth of the country, as well as its genius and virtue, have combined for the glorious object of illustrating its sad but eventful story. Two societies, the Archæological and the Celtic, have started into existence, for the purpose of publishing the ancient documents connected with the history of our country, not in jealous rivalry, but in zealous emulation of each other. The desire for this kind of knowledge, which was fostered by the Archæological society amongst the wealthier classes, having been communicated to the less affluent members of the community, it became necessary to found another association with similar objects, but on a broader and less expensive basis. The new society was so far from being treated with coldness or dislike, that it grew out of the old, many of whose most distinguished members took a prominent part in its formation, and both are now cordially co-operating in the promotion of the common object of their institution. They mutually and amicably arrange what works shall be taken up by each, so that their publications can never clash with each other. Both are eminently worthy of support, were it only on account of the example of forbearance and unanimity which they set before Irishmen. Here are two societies, each of which numbers amongst its members many of the clergy and laity of the Catholic and Protestant churches, the fellows of Trinity College, and the Professors of Maynooth, and all these hitherto antagonistic elements, which

seemed to have been governed only by the law of mutual repulsion, have combined together in the most perfect harmony, for the purpose of rescuing from oblivion the ancient records of their common country.

They have, however, other claims upon the support of Irishmen, for they have created a belief in the existence of Irish history, and a desire to know it amongst vast numbers of their fellow countrymen. It must, indeed, be acknowledged, that even yet this study is by no means so popular as it ought to be. We are still occasionally informed by some of our neighbours, who do not know so much of the subject as will make them conscious of their utter ignorance, that we have no history; and a few of our own countrymen, who act upon the old principle of "quod ignoro sperno," are silly enough to re-echo the sentiment. But the number of the latter is rapidly diminishing, especially since the establishment of these societies, and we hope that the Celtic is so popularly constituted, the subscription to it being only one pound or ten shillings per annum, that its members and its publications will be found in every hamlet in the kingdom, which will prevent Irishmen at all events from asserting that their fatherland is without history. Those who will merely read the title-pages of the books published by the Archæological and Celtic societies, or by their illustrious fellow labourers, such as James Hardiman, Dr. Petrie, and the Rev. Mr. Reeves, may hastily conclude that they are of little value. But this would be grossly unjust, for the text of these books contains a vast quantity of authentic history, and Mr. Reeves, in the admirable work which is placed at the head of this article, points out on more than one occasion, how remarkably our native annals are confirmed by the testimony of other nations. Even old fabulous stories, as Mr. O'Donovan justly observes, (Book of Rights, Introduction, p. 18.) "which are found amongst every ancient people, are worthy of preservation for the historical facts which they envelope." But the injustice would be perhaps still greater towards the editors of these works, who have enriched them with notes which are replete with learning. Mr. Reeves's Ecclesiastical Antiquities contain, besides a vast quantity of other most important matter, a complete history of almost every church, monastery, convent, and hospital, which is known to have existed in Down, Connor, and Dromore, from the introduction of christianity down

to the sixteenth century. These monuments of the pious munificence of our ancestors are indeed all in ruins ; some of them have not even been spared a stone to mark the site whereon they stood, and others would have soon shared a similar fate, if their names and localities had not been preserved in the more imperishable pages of this book. It imparts a new interest to the venerable ruins which are scattered every where over the face of the country, and by its light we are enabled to read in them the rise and progress of christianity in Ireland. There is also another matter of very great interest illustrated in this work. The names of districts, principalities, townlands, rivers, hills, mountains, castles, and churches in their ruins, and their sites long after the ruins have disappeared, retain with but few exceptions their ancient appellations. These names are not only interesting as containing a complete record of the physical aspect of the country in ancient times, but also as affording historical evidence of great value. The names even of natural objects are not always topographical, but have been frequently conferred to compliment some distinguished ruler, or to commemorate some important event. Mr. Reeves, indeed, connects with individuals, and we are inclined to agree with him, such names as Cushendun and Cushendall, which we have heard the inhabitants of those districts themselves, where the Irish is still a spoken language, explain altogether topographically. By the aid of these names, we are frequently enabled to determine particular localities, to ascertain their ancient boundaries, and to fix the dates of many important events. They are for the most part admirably explained in the "*Ecclesiastical Antiquities*," and the knowledge which the author derived from this source, was by no means the least important of the qualifications which enabled him to execute his arduous task with so much credit to himself and advantage to his country—to identify almost every stone of the ancient religious edifices of Down, and Connor, and Dromore, and invest it with the interest of authentic history. This knowledge is necessary even for the investigation of the records connected with our history, and as an instance, we may mention that, by finding that the district of Leth-Cathail, (now Lecale,) in the county of Down, derived its name from Cathail, Mr. Reeves determines the age of an historical document. It would not, however, be just not to mention, nor does the

author of the *Antiquities* conceal the fact, that he is indebted to Colgan for a vast quantity of the topographical, literary, and historical knowledge, contained in his admirable volume. That distinguished writer has, in his "*Trias Thaumaturga*," and "*Acta Sanctorum Veteris et Majoris Scotiæ*," of which unfortunately he did not live to publish more than the months of January, February, and March, done more to illustrate the antiquities of his country than any other man, and it is really wonderful that although he wrote in a foreign land, he is more accurate in that part of his works which touches on the topography, more especially of Ulster, than Usher and even than Lannigan himself. He was a perfect master of the language and of the history of his country, and more particularly of that portion of it which embraces its hagiology. The works which we have mentioned are a grand repository of learning, from which every writer upon Irish antiquities derives vast aid and abundant materials.*

The text of Mr. Reeves's book is described by himself in the following words:

"Among the various taxes," says he, (Introduction, page 1 and following,) "to which the clergy of these kingdoms were subject, in the thirteenth and following centuries, was one called the '*Decimæ Saladinæ*, or *Saladinides*.' This impost had its origin in the sensation which was experienced throughout Europe, when the intelligence arrived that the Holy City was captured by Saladin. In the year 1188, the kings of England and France, the one in a convention held at le Mans, the acts of which were in the following month ratified in the Council of Gaintington, and the other in a council assembled at Paris, imposed upon their respective subjects, a tax of one-tenth of their moveables and annual income, for the relief of the Holy Land. This assessment, however, under-

* Colgan was a native of the county of Donegal, and studied in the Franciscan college at Louvain, in which he succeeded the celebrated Hugh Ward as professor of divinity in 1635. In 1645, he published the first part of the *Acta Sanctorum Veteris et Majoris Scotiæ* at Louvain. The copy which we use is in one folio volume, containing 809 pages. His other great work is entitled, *Triadis Thaumaturgæ seu divorum Patricii Columbæ et Brigidæ, trium veteris et majoris Scotiæ seu Hiberniæ sanctorum Insulæ communium patronorum acta Studio R. P. F. S. Colgan in Conventu F. Minorum Hiberniæ strict observ. Louvanii Louvanii 1647*. He wrote several other works, and left many valuable manuscripts after him.

went an early limitation, and, in the following century, became a tax to which the clergy alone were subject. The first memorable instance of its exaction in England under its modified character was in 1254, when Henry III., agreeably to a grant which Pope Innocent the Fourth had made him the preceding year, instituted a general valuation of all ecclesiastical benefices in England, in order that he might, with the greater precision, levy the tenths of the clerical incomes, during the three years to which his grant extended.....In virtue of this same grant, a collection was made in Ireland, but whether a regular scrutiny was instituted, or how it was conducted, is not recorded. By this valor was regulated the levy which was commenced in the year 1274, agreeably to the resolution entered into during the second Council of Lyons, whereby Pope Gregory the Tenth obtained a general grant of the ecclesiastical tenths for a term of six years. This amount was collected for England in 1282, and was on the point of being remitted to Rome, when Edward the First peremptorily forbade the removal of any portion of it, and soon after took forcible possession of the whole."

This prince found means to propitiate the Pontiffs Martin IV., Honorius IV. and Nicholas IV., from whom he obtained, in 1288,

"Not only a grant of the six years tenths of England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales, which were in hand, but also of those which were to accrue in the same countries during the six succeeding years.....As the tenths of Ireland were included, a new valuation for that country was also deemed expedient, and accordingly, Pope Nicholas IV., in March, 1291, addressed a letter to Thomas St. Leger, bishop of Meath, and Thomas de Chaddesworth, dean of Dublin, the collectors for Ireland, instructing them how to proceed.....The taxation of the churches connected with the cathedral of St. Patrick and the priory of the Holy Trinity, in the diocese of Dublin, was completed in 1294, and remains of record; but concerning the rest of Ireland little is known, further than that in July, 1300, Boniface VIII. addressed a bull to the collectors appointed by Nicholas, instructing them to hand whatever balance remained in their hands, 'to certain Florentine merchants.' The money had reverted to the Pope, in consequence of the king having failed to redeem his promise of going to the assistance of the Holy Land. It was detained, however, by the king's justiciaries, and ultimately, Boniface gave the king a full release of all the sums he had received, 'in Terræ Sanctæ subsidium.' It appears that, in 1302, a fresh assessment of the tenths was imposed upon the Irish clergy, for three years at first, but the period for which it was to continue was soon extended to four, and finally to seven years. The king was to obtain three-fourths and the Pope one-fourth of the pro-

ceeds, and Richard de Berefford, treasurer of Ireland, and William de Ryver, canon of Sarum, were appointed collectors. Their agents were the rural deans; and each deanery returned its own account, concluded with the sum of the incomes and tenths therein. The details of this taxation have fortunately been preserved, and are the most ancient collection of ecclesiastical statistics, connected with Ireland, now remaining. The rolls on which they are entered, were discovered in 1807, by Mr. Vanderzee, a sub-commissioner of English records, in the office of the Remembrancer of His Majesty's Exchequer, at Westminster, whither they had been removed in the year 1323. They were deposited in a leathern pouch, marked with the name 'Hibernia;' the contents of which are stated to have been 'fourteen long rolls.' At present they are grouped together in provinces, and the four rotulets which comprise the taxation of Armagh and Tuam are stitched together at the top, and are distinguished by the title, 'Provincie Armacana Tuamen. The first rotulet is occupied *in facie* with the diocese of Armagh and part of Down; *in dorso* with the rest of Down and the whole of Connor. The dioceses of Clogher, Tirbrune or Kilmore, Raphoe, Dromore, Ardagh, and part of Derry, appear *in facie* of the second, and the rest of Derry, with Cluania, or Clonmacnois, *in dorso*. The other two rotulets are devoted to the province of Tuam. There is no date to any of the dioceses in the province of Armagh, but from the marginal note, 'vacant *pro utroque anno*,' appended to the churches of Arglass, Droneyll, and Ros in Down, it would appear that the taxation of that diocese was conducted in virtue of a grant of the tenths for *two years*. In the province of Tuam, however, there is a date, which serves as a key to the whole; it is prefixed to the taxation of Killala, and runs thus: 'Taxacio ecclesiarum civitatis et diocesis Aladensis facta per juratas die proxima post festum S. Bartholomei, Anno Domini Millesimo ccc. sexto. It may, therefore, be reasonably concluded, that the taxation of Down, Connor, and Dromore, as set out in this roll, and printed in the following pages, represents the fiscal condition of the Church in those dioceses during the years 1306 and 1307.'

The Taxation, which forms the text of Mr. Reeves's book, merely gives the names, incomes, and tenths of the various churches comprised within each of the deaneries, which it places in the margin. Its chief interest must, therefore, be derived from the identification of the places, and from the "fond memories" with which these are associated. We have already expressed our opinion of the manner in which the editor has executed this part of his subject, and of the obligation which he, as well as others, owes to Colgan, who was particularly intimate with the topography of this part of Ireland, to which he was linked

by birth and affection. We have merely one objection to make to this volume, and indeed it is common to all books of the kind, and perhaps inevitable. It does not affect the substance, but the arrangement. The order is, of course, necessarily topographical, and not chronological in its main features, and the former is the best and most natural in a book of this kind. At the same time, we are decidedly of opinion, that it ought to be followed out, by putting in the same place, as far as practicable, all that is to be said under each particular head, and by pursuing the order of time in the notes upon each separate place. It may not be a bad plan merely to explain the text at first, and to append the historical notices to the end of the volume; and indeed this practice has been now so long sanctioned by usage, and has become so inveterate, that it would be foolish to attempt to reform it. But if this be done, the note at the foot of the page should not give any part of the history which shall be related at the end of the volume; and, however numerous the incidental notices of any place may be, it should not be expressly treated of more than twice, at all events; and even then each of the notices should be entirely distinct, one of them being purely topographical, and the other purely historical. This, without adding much to the trouble of the editor, and nothing to his learning, will add vastly to the readableness of his book. These observations are applicable not only to Mr. Reeves, but to many of the other publications which we have placed at the head of this article. We do not think it necessary to assign many instances of the neglect of order in the *Ecclesiastical Antiquities*, but if any one will take the trouble of looking in the index to the words, Bangor and Dundalethglas, (Downpatrick,) and examine only a few of the numerous references to which they point, he will have abundant evidence of what we have been stating.

We have referred to Downpatrick and Bangor, because, though the notices of them in the *Ecclesiastical Antiquities* are somewhat desultory, they are, nevertheless, erudite and interesting. Concerning the former place the *Taxation* merely states:—The church of St. Patrick in Down—5 marks, tenth, 6s. 8d. Upon this the editor remarks, (p. 41):

“This is now the cathedral of Down. When John de Courcy, in 1177, invaded Ulster, he found this church attached to a house of

secular canons, and under the invocation of the Holy Trinity. In 1183 he altered its constitution, and being, as Jorelin states, 'S. Patricii specialissimus dilector et venerator,' he changed its name to "Ecclesia Sti Patricii," which it retained till 1609, when the charter of James I. revived the original title. The words Dunun and Down are formed from the Irish *dun*, a fort; and are an abbreviation of the original name *dun d'alec glap*, by which the place is generally known in Irish records."

Two stone statues representing De Courcy and his wife, the daughter of the king of Man, still remain in the ruins of the church of Grey Abbey, in the county of Down. The name of Downpatrick, which belongs to the cathedral of the diocese, as Mr. Reeves remarks, (p. 141), accords with the prevalent opinion, that it was founded by St. Patrick, although it is not expressly recorded that it owes its origin to him. The ancient Saintology represents Rossius, or Rus son of Trichen, and brother of Dichu, the first convert to Christianity in Ulidia, as presiding over the church of Dundalethglas. Originally the extent of a diocese in Ireland was not larger than that of a modern parish, and hence we find in the second and seventh lines of St. Patrick, in Colgan's collection, that St. Tassach, who administered the communion to St. Patrick in his last illness, was bishop of a little village in the parish of Saul, now called Raholp, which is within less than three miles of Downpatrick, and that there was another bishop in Bright, which is about three miles from that town in a different direction. The martyrology of Ængus commemorates the last communion of St. Patrick at the 14th of April:—

"The royal bishop of Tassach
Gave, when he came,
The body of Christ, the King truly powerful,
As communion to Patrick."

There is no notice of any succession of bishops in the churches of Bright or Raholp, so that it may be presumed that they gave way to the neighbouring church of Dundalethglas, which possessed local advantages that afterwards raised it to the rank of a cathedral.

"From a very early period Downpatrick appears to have been the capital of the surrounding territory, and the seat of the princes who governed it. About the commencement of the Christian era, a warrior, called Celtchar of the battles, one of the heroes of the *Red Branch*, and a companion of Connor Mac Ness, king of Ulster, resided here; and his abode is supposed to have been within the

large earthen fort, which, with its extensive entrenchments, is close to the cathedral on the north. From him the place was called 'the fort of Celtchar,' (Ἰ'κτ Cheλτάρη) which name was not entirely abandoned at the time of the invasion, when the town was the capital of Ulidia, although it was then more generally known by the name of Dundalethglas."—p. 142—3.

But Downpatrick owes it chief celebrity to its being the burial-place of SS. Patrick, Bridget, and Columbkille, and although this fact has sometimes been doubted, Mr. Reeves has clearly established it.—(p. 225, and following.)

The Testamentum Patricii, or will of St. Patrick, which according to Ussher, is expressed in most ancient Irish verse, contains this prophecy of the Saint, "Down where my resurrection shall be in the hill of Celthar, the son of Duach." The acts of St. Brigid also say he is buried in the city of *Ladglaisse* or *Leathglaysse*, (Downpatrick,) and there his body shall remain until the day of judgment. It is a singular fact that St. Bridget, who died in 523, was buried in Kildare, and that long afterwards, probably in 799, her remains were placed in a costly shrine; whilst it is equally certain that St. Columbkille was buried in Hy, in 594, according to the annals of Ulster, and that he was likewise disinterred a century or two afterwards, and his relics placed in a splendid shrine which excited the cupidity of the Danes, when they ravaged the island in 824. Walafridus Strabo says, in his metrical life of the abbot Blaithmic, who suffered martyrdom because he would not discover the sacred shrine, "Hanc prædam cupiere Dani." Four years after this, the remains were sent to Scotland, and thence to Ireland in 830, from which they were shortly afterwards brought back to Hy, but were again returned to Ireland in 848. They were once more restored to Iona, for it is stated that the shrine of St. Columba was conveyed to Ireland in 877 to save it from the Danes. About this time it is supposed that his remains were deposited in Down; but why there instead of Derry or Durrow, cannot be easily accounted for, except by the supposition that it was out of respect to the memory of St. Patrick. Kildare also was ravaged by the Danes about the same date; for in 835, a party of them from Inbhea-Dia, (the mouth of the Vartrey,) assailed it and burned the church. And to this cause it is supposed was owed the transfer of St. Bridget's remains to Down. Keating relates the following prophecy of St. Columba regarding this event.

"My prosperity in guiltless Hy,
And my soul in Derry,
And my body under the flag
Beneath which are Patrick and Brigid."

"In the *Topographia Hib.* (Dist. iii. cap. 18.) of Giraldus Cambrensis, where he relates the translation of the relics of Bridget, Patrick, and Columba, the well known distich is quoted as being then familiarly known, for he introduces it by the words '*unde versus,*'

'In burgo Duno tumulto tumultantur in uno
Brigida, Patritius, atque Columba Pius.'"

The relics of the three saints had been concealed from the fury of the Danes who had burnt the town, and pillaged the Cathedral six or seven times between the years 940 and 1111. In 1177, John De Courcy took possession of the town, which was then the residence of Mac Dunleve, prince of Ullagh. He found the Church attached to a house of secular canons, and under the invocation of the Holy Trinity. In 1183 he displaced the canons, and substituted a community of Benedictine monks from the Abbey of St. Werburgh at Chester, and endowed it amply out of the episcopal revenues of Down. Mr. Reeves gives, at pages 163-4, the instrument by which Malachy III., who was then bishop, and whom De Courcy had already taken prisoner, granted to the English prior and his monks the church of the Holy Trinity, the name of which was changed to that of the church of St. Patrick, and transferred to them a great part of the temporalities of his see. This bishop was greatly grieved because he could not discover where the relics of Patrick, Brigid, and Columbkille had been concealed; and it is related, that one day as he was praying in the church, his attention was miraculously directed to an obscure part of it, or more probably, as another account says, to a particular spot in the Abbey yard, where, when the earth was removed, their sacred relics were found reposing in, as it were, a triple cave, (*quasi in spelunca triplici*) Patrick in the middle, and one of the others on either side of him. This is the account of Giraldus Cambrensis, (*ubi supra*) who also says that the discovery was supernatural, *tres nobile thesauri divina revelatione inventi sunt*. At the request of De Courcy delegates were sent to Rome by the bishop to acquaint Pope Urban III. of the matter, who no sooner heard it, than he sent Cardinal Vivian to Ireland to preside at the

solemn translation of these sacred relics. The ceremony took place in 1186, upon the 9th of June, which is the festival of St. Columba, when the mortal remains of the three saints were deposited in the same monument, at the right side of the high altar. The bard O'Dugan, in 1372, recorded the matter in the following verses:

“From Dundaethglas of the Cassocs,
It is the royal cemetery of Erin,
Without my heed or gain there,
A town wherein the clay of Columb was covered.
In the same grave was buried
Bridget the victory of females;
And as we leave them every victory,
Patrick of Macha is in the great grave.”—Reeves, 227-8.

On this occasion, the right hand of St. Patrick was enshrined, and placed upon the High Altar.

Edward Bruce, when he invaded Ulster, having marched to Downpatrick in 1315, destroyed the abbey, from which he carried off the enshrined hand of St. Patrick, and burnt part of the town: and again in 1318 he plundered the town and caused himself to be proclaimed king at the cross which stood near the cathedral. We find this cross mentioned in one of the grants of John de Courcy to the abbey (circa A. D. 1182).—“Concessi Ecclesiæ S. Trinitatis de Dune terram dextra parte S. Georgii intransitibus murum usque ad curiam S. Columbæ; et a curia S. Columbæ per vicum juxta *crucem* S. Moninnæ usque ad murum.” “The cross,” says Mr. Reeves, “which is here alluded to, was probably that which Harris describes: ‘Near the court-house in the street lie (in 1744) the several pieces of an old stone cross, on the shaft of which is carved a crucifix or image of Jesus. It is generally called the market-cross.....The pedestal is one of solid stone in form of a cube, about three feet high; the shaft or pillar twelve inches by sixteen, and five feet high, and the cross about four feet high,—all of a stone called the lapis molaris or grit.’ Tiberius, who presided over the see in 1500, is said by Ware to have ‘much beautified’ his cathedral, ‘for the purpose of promoting the divine worship, and also out of reverence to the venerable relics of SS. Patrick, Columba, and Bridget, who are buried there in the same tomb.’” In 1538, Lord Grey, who had marched into Lecale for the purpose of establishing the spiritual supremacy of Henry VIII. by fire and sword, effaced the statues

of the three patron saints, and burned the cathedral; for which act, along with many others equally laudable, he was beheaded three years afterwards. It remained in this ruinous condition for more than two centuries and a half, until 1790; and on this account Lisburn had been erected into a cathedral in 1663. Although James I. had restored to this church in 1609 its first name of the "*Ecclesia SS. Trinitatis*," it is still known to the townspeople, and to those who reside near Downpatrick, only by the appellation of "the old abbey."

An ancient round tower stood about forty feet S.W. from the church, of which Mr. Reeves quotes Harris's description (p. 230):

"The cloietheach or belfry of this church stands," writes Harris in 1774, "about forty feet from the old cathedral, is sixty-six feet high, the thickness of the walls three feet, and the diameter of the inside eight feet. On the west side of it is an irregular gap about ten feet from the top, near a third of the whole circumference being broken off by the injury of time. The entrance into it is two feet and a half wide, and placed on a level with the surface of the ground; in which last particular it is pretty singular, for in others the door is placed from eight to twelve feet above the ground, without any steps or stairs, so that there is no getting into the building without a ladder, unless it may be judged, (which is probable enough,) that this difference has been occasioned by the rising of the ground by the rubbish of the old cathedral near it fallen into ruinous heaps. This appendage of the ancient abbey was taken down during the autumn of 1783, being considered an unsightly as well as an unserviceable object!"

The old market-cross and the round tower were both swept away; the former, as we have been told, by the madness of a puritanical populace, and the latter by the vandalism of the then lord of the soil on which it stood. Just seven years after the destruction of the venerable tower, the restoration of the church was undertaken,—a government grant of a thousand pounds having been added to private contributions, and a rent charge of £.300 per annum having been appropriated by act of parliament from the tithes of the ancient union, partly for its repairs, and partly for the support of an organist, three vicars choral, and six choristers. The commencement of this work is remembered with horror by many who are still living. The church had been surrounded by a burying-ground, which was almost exclusively the resting-place of

the mortal remains of those who died in the town and in the neighbourhood. They wished to repose near the place where the relics of the three great patron saints of Ireland were enshrined. The graves were mingled with the ruins of the old abbey, and touched its dilapidated foundations. All these were exhumed without mercy—the whole area around was covered with human bones—and the people assembled from far and near to gather the mutilated remains of their departed kinsfolk. The greater part of the poor Catholics were refused any other spot in this burial-ground, and were obliged to carry away the mouldering bones of their deceased relations, and to consign them to the earth in some other place. But the greatest horror was justly occasioned by the profanation of what was believed to be the “great tomb” in which Bridget, Patrick, and Columbkille had slept for more than six centuries. It was torn open, and the remains which were found in it were flung out of the church. The people gathered them up, and buried them nearly in the centre of the old grave-yard, and placed at the head of the grave the old market-cross, which had been sadly mutilated, one of its arms having been almost entirely broken off, and the image of Jesus being effaced from it.* So great was the horror which the atrocities that were then perpetrated created in the minds of the people, that they believed the new church would never be finished; and it is very strange that the tower fell more than once in the course of its erection, and that it was not ultimately completed until within the last

* We relate these matters from memory, without being able, at present, to consult any of the old people of the neighbourhood, who could give accurate information concerning them. We know not if any human bones were found in the “great grave,” or whether, if there were, there is any evidence that they were the relics of the three saints. But, however this may be, the violation of the tomb was regarded by all with horror; nor do we know whether the present “St. Patrick’s grave” is supposed to have been the burial-place of the saint, at any period antecedent to 1790, or what authority there is to prove that the old mutilated cross which used to stand at its head, is the remnant of the old market-cross described by Harris. The stone is certainly the same as that mentioned by Harris: it is evidently of great antiquity, and the older inhabitants asserted, some ten or twelve years ago, that it was part of the market-cross. However, on these particulars our information is not, at present, so precise as to enable us to vouch for its accuracy.

twenty years. The lowly grave, however, which contained the remains of the three patron saints of all Ireland, and which was only distinguished by the rude and broken cross, was held in as much reverence as if it had been the most costly shrine. The faithful assembled around it to ask the prayers and intercession of the Saint who had been the messenger sent by heaven to shed the light of faith amongst them. The barbarians who think that hatred of the cross and of God's saints is the best evidence of Christianity, carried away the old cross from the grave a few years ago, and attempted to break it. Since then it has been kept locked up in the church, to save it from the fury of these zealous Christians! There is something abhorrent, not only to religion, but to human nature, in such conduct as this. The remains of the dead were in general treated with respect by pagan nations, as well as by the patriarchs and the Jews. Even the savages who were guilty of these atrocities, would not have dreamt of perpetrating them against any remains but those of the saints who spent their whole lives in the noble work of teaching the fathers of those who insult them in their graves, to know and to love the Lord Jesus Christ. In connection with the above observations we may mention an undoubted fact, which every person, of course, is at liberty to explain as he pleases,—that out of a considerable number of persons who, within the memory of many who are still living, tore down an old cross which stood in the city of Armagh, not one has died a natural death—not one of them has gone to the grave without the coroner having held an inquest on his body. This *may* be ascribed to accident; but it is, to say the least of it, very extraordinary.

These facts are entirely passed over by Mr. Reeves, probably because in his position it would be inconvenient to speak of them as he could wish. But we confess, that we were greatly astonished that, after giving so long and minute an account of the curious old bell in the possession of Mr. Adam McClean of Belfast, he should have omitted all mention of the shrine of St. Patrick's hand. This beautiful relic consists of a silver case in the shape of the hand and arm, cut off a little below the elbow. It is considerably thicker than the hand and arm of an ordinary man, as if it were intended to enclose these members without pressing upon them closely. The fingers are bent so as to represent the hand in the attitude of benediction. The

case is now empty, the cause of which we are not at present prepared to explain ; but no one can look at it, and doubt for a moment that it was the shrine of the hand and arm of a saint, and it was always regarded as having contained the hand and arm of St. Patrick. It has been known in the whole county of Down as "St. Patrick's hand" from time immemorial. This beautiful relic is now in the possession of the Right Rev. Dr. Denvir, the Catholic bishop of Down and Connor, for whom it was procured by the Rev. James McAlenan, P. P. Castlewella, to whom we are indebted for an account of its preservation. We have already mentioned that, at the time of the translation of the relics of SS. Patrick, Bridget, and Columbkille, in the twelfth century, under the auspices of Cardinal Vivian, the hand of St. Patrick was enshrined and placed upon the high altar of the abbey church in Downpatrick. When Edward Bruce, during his invasion of Ireland, plundered the abbey church of Downpatrick, this relic was carried off and entrusted to the care of some persons who accompanied the army. On the defeat of that prince at Dundalk, in 1318, the person who had charge of it escaped out of the battle, and afterwards, for greater security, it was given to one of the Maginis family, the head of which had about this time obtained the title of Lord of Iveagh. It remained in this family until the early part of the last century. At that time Mr. Maginis of Castlewella had possession of it. He had an only daughter who married Charles Russell, a gentleman whose ancestors had possessed a large tract of the county Down to the south of Downpatrick. With this lady the sacred relic passed into the Russell family. She died shortly after her marriage, and her husband married Miss Savage of Portaferry-house, grand-aunt of the late Colonel Nugent, who died two or three years ago. Colonel Nugent's father obtained the relic on the death of his aunt, Mrs. Russell. He was the first Protestant who had ever possessed it, and entertaining some scruple about keeping it, he gave it to the Rev. Mr. Taggart, then parish priest of Portaferry in the Ards. Mr. Savage of Portaferry, who was the representative of the family to which that Mrs. Russell, through whom the relic came into the possession of the Nugents, belonged, desired after Mr. Taggart's death that it should be given to Mr. McHenry of Kerstown in the Upper Ards, because his

mother's maiden name had been Russell, and she was also nearest of kin to the gentleman of that name who had to his first wife the only daughter of Maginis. Since that time "St. Patrick's hand" remained in the possession of the McHenry's, until about seven or eight years ago, when the Right Rev. Dr. Denvir got possession of it. The family of the McHenry's had become poor previously to this time, and it is said that many tempting offers were made to them, both by the late Colonel Nugent, who was most anxious to obtain it, and by a person from Trinity College, Dublin. But they could not be induced to give it up to those who would only use it for profane purposes.

Of the *Leabhar nag-Ceart*, the editor, Mr. O'Donovan, who may without offence be pronounced to be the most accomplished of living Irish scholars, gives the following interesting account (Introduction, p. 1 and following):

"Two ancient vellum copies of this work are in existence; one in the *Leabhar Leacain* (Book of 'Lecan'), which was compiled from various other MSS. by Giolla Iosa Mor Mac Fírbisigh, of Leacan in the county of Sligo, chief historian to O'Dubhda (O'Dowda), in the year 1418. This copy begins at folio 184, and ends at folio 193, comprising thirty-eight closely written columns of the book. The other copy is preserved in *Leabhar Bhaile an Mhuta* (Book of 'Ballymote') which was compiled by various persons, but chiefly by Solamh O'Droma, from older MSS., about the year 1390, for Tomaltach Mac Dunchadha (Mac Donough), then chief of the territories of Tir Oiliolla, Corann, Airteach, Tir Thuathail, and Clauan Fearn-mhaighe, extending into the counties of Sligo, Roscommon, and Leitrim. This copy begins at folio 147, and ends at folio 154 a. col. 2, comprising thirty columns of that book.....An abstract of this work was published by Hugh Mac Curtin, in his brief '*Discourse in Vindication of the Antiquities of Ireland*,' pp. 173, 175, and pp. 221, 240. An abstract of it is also given by Dr. John O'Brien, the R. C. bishop of Cloyne, in his '*Dissertations on the Laws of the Ancient Irish*,' a work which was published by Vallancy, in 1774, in the third number of the *Collectanea de Rebus Hibernicis*, where this abstract occupies from p. 374 to p. 389. The suppression of O'Brien's name in the publication of this has caused confusion. Thus, when the author says, 'in my copy of the *Annales Innisfallenses* I find,' &c., all subsequent writers took for granted that this referred to Vallancy's copy of these Annals; whereas the fact turns out to be, that the 'my copy of the *Annales, Innisfallenses*,' throughout this book, refers to a compilation of Annals made for Dr. John O'Brien by John Conry, in 1760, at Paris, from all accessible Irish, Anglo-Irish, and English sources, of which the autograph is now preserved in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin, with various

marginal condemnatory notes in the hand-writing of Charles O'Connor of Belanagare. In consequence of the suppression of Dr. O'Brien's name in connection with that work, it has been quoted as Vallancy's own by all those who have since treated of the subject, but more particularly by Mr. Moore, who frequently quotes Vallancy's Dissertation on the Laws of Tanistry in his History of Ireland as a work of authority. The original Irish of the present work, however, never saw the light before the present edition, and writers have been quoting from it as the genuine work of Benean or St. Benignus, who was the disciple of St. Patrick, and his Coharba or successor at Ard Macha (Armagh), but without letting the public know where the best copies of it are preserved, or what real claims it has to be considered the genuine work of St. Benean.

"Benean was of a Munster family, being descended from Tadhg Mac Cein (the grandson of Olioll Ohum, king of Munster), to whom King Cormac Mac Airt, about the year 254, had granted the territory of Cianachta Breagh, which comprised the district around Daimhliag (Duleek), and all the plains from thence to the hills of Maeldoid at the river Life (Liffey). The occasion of his conversion to Christianity is described in all the old lives of St. Patrick, and in Benean's own life. St. Patrick being at Leath Cathail (Lecale in Down), and having determined on celebrating the Easter of the year 433 near Teamhair or Tara, where he knew the Feis Teamhrach was then to be celebrated by the king and all his toparchs, took leave of his northern friend and convert Dicho, and sailing southwards, put into the harbour of Inbhear Colpa (Colp), the mouth of the Boinn or Boyne. There he left his boat in care of one of his disciples, and set out on foot through the great plain of Breagh (Bregia), in which the palace (of Tara) was situate. On their way, and not long after landing, they went to the house of a respectable (noble) man (*vir nobilis*) named Sescnean, where they were entertained and passed the night. St. Patrick is said on this occasion to have converted and baptized this Sescnean and all his family, among whom was Benean, then seven years old, to whom, at the baptism, St. Patrick gave the name of Benignus, from his benign disposition. This boy became so attached to St. Patrick, that he insisted on going along with him. St. Patrick received him with pleasure into his society, and Benignus thenceforth became one of his most favourite disciples.....When he became qualified to preach the Gospel, he was employed in various parts of Ireland, and particularly in those regions which St. Patrick had not visited in person.....Benignus afterwards, in 455, upon St. Patrick's retirement (to Down), succeeded him in the primacy: and having himself resigned his bishopric in 465, died on the 9th November, 468, and was buried in Armagh."

The occasion of his writing the "Book of Rights" was

as follows. Previously to his elevation to the primacy, he had "become in a special manner the patron of Connaught, where he erected his principal church of Kilbarrow, in the barony of Dunmore and county of Galway. The remains of a round tower still indicate the ancient importance of the place." "It is added that he blessed Connaught, at which the Munster tribes were greatly offended, as Benignus was not only a native of their province, but descended from their kings." To make amends he composed that famous chronicon called the "*Psalter of Caiseal*," in which are described the acts, laws, prerogatives, and succession, not only of the monarchs of all Ireland, but also those of the kings of Munster. After quoting a passage from Colgan, to prove that "Benean composed some such Book of Rights as the present, and placed it in the *Saithair Chaisil*," Mr. O'Donovan continues:

"Edward O'Reilly (in his '*Irish Writers*,' p. 2) saw the fallacy of attributing the authorship of the Book of Rights in its present form to St. Benean, and expressed his doubts as to the fact, as the language and some internal evidences in the composition show it to be at least enlarged and altered in a period nearer to our times. In fact, though it cannot be denied that there was a *Leabhar na g-Ceart* drawn up after the establishment of Christianity, which received the sanction of St. Benignus, it cannot be pronounced that any part of the work in its present form was written by that bishop.....It is probable, indeed, that the account was originally digested, and perhaps put into metre by St. Benean, but that the work was afterwards, towards the beginning of the tenth century, altered and enlarged by Cormac Mac Cuileannain, bishop-king of Caiseal or Munster, assisted by Sealbach the sage, and Aenghus, so as to agree with the tribes and subdivisions of Ireland at that period. This appears quite plain from the notices of Sealbach and Aenghus at p. 60, and of Mac Cuileannain at p. 86."

To some of the pieces a still later date must be assigned, but for more particular information on this head, and also for an account of the *Saltair Chaisil*, the will of *Cathaeir Mor*, and other pieces introduced into *Leabhar na g-Ceart*, and of the curious "Tract on the Restrictions and Prerogatives of the Kings of Eire," which is prefixed to the Book of Rights, we must refer to Mr. O'Donovan's learned and interesting Introduction, which occupies 67 pages of the volume.

The Book of Rights is written in verse, and "gives an account of the monarchs of all Ireland, and the revenues

payable to them by the principal kings of the several provinces, and of the stipends paid by the monarchs to the inferior kings for their services. It also treats of the rights of each of the provincial kings, and the revenues payable to them from the inferior kings of the districts or tribes subsidiary to them, and of the stipends paid by the superior to the inferior provincial kings for their services. The accounts are authoritatively delivered in verse, each poem being introduced by a prose statement; and of those joint pieces, twenty-one in number, seven are devoted to Munster, and the rights of the *Ḷḥḡ mṛ*, or monarch of all Ireland are treated of under this head; for it first supposes the King of Munster to be monarch, and then subjoins an account of his rights, when he is not king over all Ireland. Two pieces are then devoted to the province of Connaught, two to each of the three divisions of Ulster, two to Midhe or Meath, and two to Leinster, with an additional poem on the Galls or foreigners of Dublin, and a concluding piece on the rights of the kings of Teamhair or Tara. The prose usually purports to be a short statement or summary of the poem which follows, and which it treats as a pre-existing document." The notes of the editor at the foot of the page are very copious and learned, and although Colgan is as usual called on for large and frequent contributions, yet his name is totally omitted from the index, on the ground, we presume, that he has long since become the common property of Irish antiquaries. The original Irish is printed on the left hand page, and a literal translation accompanies it on the right. The manner in which this volume has been "got out" reflects the highest credit on Mr. Hudson, to whom the Celtic society entrusted its superintendence whilst passing through the press, and on Messrs. Hodges and Smyth, the spirited publishers. There is to be an elegant design on the cover of the volume, taken from St. Columbanus's copy of the gospels, called the book of Durrow, and Wadding, Usher, and O'Flaherty, are grouped together in a fine frontispiece. We are quite certain that this volume will raise the character of the society which has issued it, that it will give a high idea of its capabilities and usefulness, and that it will secure for it general support.

The Archæological Society is so widely known all over the empire, and its character stands so deservedly high in public estimation, that it is independent of any man's

eulogy. The names under whose auspices its volumes have been issued, are a sufficient guarantee of their merits, and Messrs. Hodges and Smyth have displayed their usual elegance in their publication. It would be impossible, within the compass of an article, to notice these books in detail, but it must be sufficiently evident, even from the titles, that they contain many of the most ancient and valuable records of our country, which are no where else accessible to the generality of readers.

Yet it must be confessed that we have not yet any one book which we can point to, and say "there is the civil or ecclesiastical history of Ireland." A vast quantity of materials will be found in the writings of Keating, O'Flaherty, Messingham, Ward, Ussher, Colgan, Fleming, De Burgo, Wadding, Ware, O'Reilly, and others too numerous to mention, most of whom, in the execution of their task, had to struggle against difficulties which would have deterred all but the most heroic labourers. When this noble work was abandoned by almost all others during the eighteenth century, it was still persecuted zealously and hopefully by a few priests who did not despair of their country amid all her woes, but toiled for her night and day in a foreign land. Mr. Reeves deplores the apathy, or as it should be more truly called, the hostility of the protestant clergy during this period in the following words: "the diocesan records of Down, Connor, and Dromore, which are deposited in the registry offices are, it is to be regretted, very scanty and unsatisfactory. Inadequate provision for their safety, and the indifference which unhappily prevailed during the last century concerning ancient documents, have resulted in this barrenness. There are, however, a few *disjecta membra* of the diocesan muniments still remaining."

In the beginning of the present century Doctor Lanigan, a Catholic priest, rivalled the fame of the most illustrious of his order who had written before him, in his Ecclesiastical history of Ireland.* This great work created a spirit

* Doctor Lanigan was born in Cashel, in 1758. At the age of eighteen he entered the Irish College at Rome, where he greatly distinguished himself. Having taken out his degree as Doctor of Divinity, he was appointed professor of Scripture Hebrew, and Ecclesiastical history, in the Hanoverian college of the celebrated university of Pavia. On the invasion of Lombardy by Napoleon,

of inquiry that, combined with other causes, has resulted in the establishment of the Archæological and the Celtic societies, which are vieing with each other in the publication of our ancient annals, illustrated by the research of O'Donovan, Hardiman,* and others of scarcely inferior acquirements. Many volumes, which it has not yet been found possible to publish, have been transcribed and rendered intelligible in the beautiful Caligraphy of Curry. The enthusiasm has diffused itself from public bodies to individuals, and amongst the most valuable fruits of this awakened spirit is the learned book on the Ecclesiastical Antiquities of Down, Connor, and Dromore, written in a kind and Christian spirit by a Protestant curate of the county of Antrim. It has been sometimes remarked most unreasonably, that no Irish Catholic priest has yet taken his place in the front ranks of those who are labouring to restore Irish literature. In the first place we can point to the illustrious names which we have already mentioned in this article, and amongst others to Dr. Lanigan, who has not been dead twenty years. Again, the proscription which continued in force against Irish priests and Irish literature until the last few years, and the almost incessant duties of the mission rendered it impossible for those who *remained in Ireland* to devote themselves to this kind of study.

the French troops occupied Pavia in 1796, and the university was broken up. The young French general invited them to return, and promised them protection; however, Dr. Lanigan came to Ireland, and attached himself first to Francis Street Chapel, Dublin; but shortly afterwards retired to the Capuchin Convent of St. Francis, Church Street. He was subsequently elected to one of the professor's chairs of Maynooth, but some difficulties arose which prevented him from entering that establishment. In 1799, he was unanimously elected by the members of the Dublin society as their translator, editor, and corrector of the press, and in 1808, he became their librarian. In 1822, he published in four volumes, octavo, his celebrated Ecclesiastical History of Ireland, which commences with St. Patrick, and ends at the beginning of the thirteenth century. It is distinguished by great erudition, and vast and varied learning. He died on the seventh of July, 1828, and is buried in Finglass, near Dublin.

* Mr. Hardiman has edited for the Archæological Society a splendid volume, containing a geographical description of West Connaught, and has published another of scarcely inferior merit, entitled *Irish Minstrelsy*. The notes to both are learned and valuable.

They laboured under two insuperable difficulties ; for first, they could scarcely snatch a moment for study from the active duties of the mission ; and secondly, all their books were taken away and destroyed or locked up in Trinity College, Stowe, or some other place, where, until very lately, a Catholic priest would not dare to think of entering. The professors of Maynooth were the only persons from whom any co-operation could have been hitherto expected, and the library of that establishment is not only destitute of manuscripts but it does not even contain a single copy of the printed works of Wadding, Scotus, or a great many other illustrious Irishmen. Besides, the professors of that establishment could assign quite as satisfactory a reason for their silence as the first of the forty which the mayor of a certain town pleaded as an apology for not saluting his sovereign, namely, that he had no Cannon : for, unless they had previously obtained permission, they were absolutely prohibited from publishing any thing under pain of expulsion. We believe this law, which we cannot trust ourselves to characterize, has been either actually repealed, or is in the way of being abolished or modified in some way which will render it less injurious to the interests of the country and the character of the college. We have, indeed, been told that many anonymous writings of great merit were from the pens of the professors of Maynooth, who dare not however acknowledge them ; and we perceive by an advertisement that the second publication of the Celtic society is to be edited by the Rev. Mr. Kelly, who is a member of that body.

All, however, that has as yet been done or attempted, is to render accessible the materials and to facilitate the writing of Irish history. The proper method has been adopted, for each particular part must be written before the whole can be combined in one consecutive narrative. From the vast number of ponderous tomes which we have enumerated along with other works and manuscripts which we hope to see published ere long, a pretty accurate knowledge of our history may be gleaned. But this would require the study of years ; and so long as our native annals remain in this condition we cannot hope to make foreigners, or even the great masses of our own countrymen, acquainted with them. What we desire to see is a popular, civil, and ecclesiastical history of Ireland, which will combine elegance with accuracy, and which will be read, not

as a study, but on account of the amusement and relaxation which it will afford, so that we can turn to it with delight in the moments that are not occupied by severer duties. To accomplish this was heretofore impossible, but every new contribution is bringing us nearer its fulfilment. A vast quantity of materials have been collected, and every day is adding to their bulk. To the vulgar eye they may appear to be huge and disordered masses, which can serve only to cumber the ground, but at the touch of genius they will combine into one glorious and harmonious fabric.

There are one or two points, however, of extreme interest which the present spirit of enquiry has scarcely reached, and concerning which nothing has as yet been done in our own country. The first regards the history of the labours of those Irish ecclesiastics, who were the apostles at first of the faith and afterwards of piety and learning, throughout a great portion of Europe, from about the middle of the sixth to the twelfth, or even to the fourteenth century. If any person entertain the slightest doubts upon this point let him turn to the Bollandists, at the 9th of June, and read their introduction to the life of the blessed Marianus Scotus; he will there see how they were first regarded as the founders of the faith, and that afterwards their presence was desired in various countries by kings and bishops, to serve as models of virtue, and to instruct the people in piety and learning, and so much were they loved by the latter that many of them who, out of devotion, undertook pilgrimages to Rome, were detained by the simple faithful in France, Italy, and Germany, and induced to found monasteries and remain there for the remainder of their days. The reason why they always founded monasteries is thus explained by the Bollandists in the introduction to the life of the blessed Marianus. "The many holy men who, for a thousand years, (this life was written about two centuries ago) have gone from Scotia* (Ireland) to Ger-

* Scotia. Ireland was anciently called Scotia, as every one knows. The blessed Marianus, whose life the Bollandists are here writing, is called a Scotus or Scot, although undoubtedly an Irishman, as is stated by the writer of his life which the Bollandists published, and who was almost his contemporary. Marianus Scotus died in 1086, and is not to be confounded with the Irish Chronographer of the same name, who died in 1088. For the period at

many and France, either to plant the faith amongst idolaters, or to propagate virtue by word and example, have almost all built monasteries in those countries, and sometimes one has built many, as we read in the acts of SS. Columbanus, Gallus, Furseus, and others. (These *Scottish* monks were all *Irish*, as every one knows.) For these wise men knew that they were not more necessary as places of retirement for themselves, whither, when wearied with labours and cares, they might betake themselves for a little, and imbibe a new spirit from the meditation of divine truths, than as schools of learning and discipline for the instruction and training of those whom they associated with themselves as their fellow labourers in their holy undertakings and destined for their successors. For neither can the people, without teachers, preserve their faith pure or their morals undefiled, nor can the teachers themselves be qualified to discharge their duties properly, unless there be some such schools of piety and learning where they may be instructed and disciplined at first, and where they may be purified by wholesome advice and good example from any contagion they may afterwards catch in their intercourse with a profane world. "They proceed to assign other reasons for building monasteries, such as that there should be places of rest and hospitality open to their countrymen, whom piety often led to the tombs of the apostles, and also to comply with the wishes of princes and people who anxiously desired the Irish to remain and found monasteries amongst them, which were always seminaries of piety and learning." The good Benedictine, who wrote the life of the blessed Marianus, which is given by the Bollandists, and who calls himself a Scottish (Irish) monk, who lived in the monastery which was founded by that venerable man, and who relates his history as he heard it from one of his disciples and contemporaries, thus explains why the Irish left their own country to found monasteries in distant lands." They forsook their country, property, and dear relations, joyfully casting away transitory for eternal things, and followed Christ "perque tot maria perque tot invia regna." Cap. iii. n. 14. Again, Cap. ii. n. 32, he returns to the same subject, and

which the name Scotia began to be applied to the modern Scotland, see Fleming's *Collectanea Sacra*, and *Cambrensis Eversus*, chap. 17, 18.

the language in which he speaks of his native land is so simple and affectionate that we cannot resist the temptation of transcribing it in the original: "*dulce solum natalis patriæ, solum omni genere serpentum ac universis vermibus nocivis sequestratum, montes et colles et valles venantibus aptas, amœnissima fluentum flumina et virides terras, ex puris fontibus amnes, derelinquentes tanquam filii Abrahæ patriarchæ in terram quam eisdem Deus præmonstraverit præcipitantes.*" It will be evident to those who will take the trouble of inquiring into the subject, that Irishmen have been for six or eight centuries, the chief lights of Europe; that their virtues and learning have inscribed their names in the calendars of the saints, and at the head of the instructors of the most civilized nations in the world; and that the graves of many among them, whose very names are scarcely known in their own country, have been for nearly a thousand years, places of pilgrimage in a strange land, and in the midst of a strange people. Their festivals were celebrated for centuries abroad, before their offices were recited at home; and even now, such of them as have been introduced to the devotion of their own countrymen, are destitute of the ordinary abstract of the Saint's life, which is contained in the lessons of the second nocturn, except in those instances in which it has been extracted from some foreign breviary. It may be truly said, that to their fame

"Their place of birth alone is mute."

The second point of our history to which we are anxious to point particular attention, is that which concerns the Catholic Church from the time of the Reformation to the year 1829. The story is a sad one, but it is full of the deepest interest; and it is the more necessary that this subject should be taken up at once, as many of the most valuable materials for its composition exist only in the memories and traditions of the people, and are therefore of so perishable a nature that they must inevitably be lost if they be not soon collected. We have already noticed that this is a subject which Mr. Reeves scarcely ever touches upon, perhaps because he did not think they came under the designation of antiquities. We might mention numerous instances of omissions of this kind, as for instance at p. 42, where he extracts from Harris an interesting account of the

“very ancient” wells of St. Patrick, at Struell, in the parish Down, near one of which there is the ruins of a small chapel dedicated to St. Patrick. The Catholics used to assemble in this secluded place on Midsummer-eve and the Friday before Lammas, for devotional purposes. The priests attended to hear confessions all day and frequently all night, and to celebrate the divine mysteries and administer the holy communion in the morning, until towards the close of the last century, when the Puritans assembled at night, and in arms, from all parts of the country, and fired upon a multitude of men, women, and children, and slew many of them. At page 30, the Prebend of Ballykilby is mentioned; and it is said that traces of a burial place have been discovered at the south side of a small earthen fort, which lies a little north of the Roman Catholic chapel, near the junction of Ballykilby, (correctly, Ballygalby, the town of the little battle), and Lough-Falcon. The small earthen fort in question, is in the townland of Cargagh, and the place called Lough-Falcon, should be written, Lough-Faughan, which signifies the lake of the bulrushes. We were not aware, although we are pretty diligent inquirers after matters of this kind, that there were any traces of a church-yard at Cargagh fort, but at all events we are quite certain that the reasons for building Ballygalbeg chapel in its present position, were totally unconnected with any church which may have existed in or near its present locality. There was no ruin nor any tradition to connect the site of the present chapel with any pre-existing church. Being a low place, it was selected for the celebration of the divine mysteries during the days of persecution; and we have often conversed with the men who watched on the surrounding hills whilst the priest said mass in this spot. The townland of Ballygalbeg belonged to a Catholic gentleman, and when the persecution abated, he granted this site for an humble thatched chapel, which was the first erected in that part of the country. It was afterwards raised, slated, and an aisle added to it, which made it cruciform; but becoming quite dilapidated, the present neat church was erected by the parish priest, the Rev. B. M’Auley. From circumstances of this kind, several places have obtained the appellations by which they are at present known; as, for instance, Friar’s Bush, near Belfast, which is now a Catholic burial place, has been so called from a tree under which a

friar used to celebrate mass towards the end of the last century. There is no part of Ireland that is not rich in authentic stories of this kind,* which ought to be interwoven with the history of the times, and without which it must lose much of the life-like colouring from which the records of every country derive their chief interest. We have visited with feelings as solemn and reverential, the secluded glen in the county of Antrim, where, within the last seventy years, Dr. M'Carton, the Catholic bishop of Down and Connor, met his clergy at midnight to deliver to them the instructions of Lent; and the summit of Slieve Donard, in the county of Down, in search of the chapel of St. Domangard, where, far away from all human habitations, great numbers of the faithful used to assemble during the sad days of persecution; as any of the places hallowed by their association with the more early and peaceful triumphs of christianity in Ireland. "Slieve Donard," says Mr. Reeves, (p. 207), "takes its name from Domangard, a Saint, who was born about the commencement of the sixth century." He then quotes the following words from Colgan, (*Acta. SS.* p. 743), concerning the two chapels of that Saint, one of which was that we have just mentioned as being situated on the lofty and rugged summit of the mountain, to which the people resorted during the long and weary years of religious persecution. "*Duæ ecclesiæ ipsi consecratæ: una ad radices, altissimi montis mari ad orientem imminentis priscis Rath murbhuilg, hodie Machaire-Ratha appellata; altera in vertice ejusdem editissimi montis longe ab omni humana habitatione posita; quæ tamen etiam sæviante dura, diraque hæreticorum persecutione, consuevit magno populi accursu, et continuis peregrinationibus, in honorem hujus magnifici servi Dei, multis ibi signis et miraculis corruscantis frequentari.*"

* Mr. Hardiman has collected a great deal of scarce and curious information on the subject of which we have been speaking, especially with regard to the west of Ireland, both in his edition of "*West Connaught*," published by the Archæological Society, as already stated, and in his "*Irish Minstrelsy*."

ART. IX. — *Sermons, Academical and Occasional.* By the Rev.
JOHN KEBLE, Vicar of Hursley, &c. Oxford: Parker.

THERE is not in the history of dogma a more lamentable contrast than is presented by the beginning and the close of the High-church controversy; for, as a controversy, it may truly be considered at an end. A few years ago a knot of ardent, zealous, learned, and devout Anglicans started the generous undertaking of raising the religious system to which they belonged to what they considered its becoming standard. They believed it to be debased, crippled, diseased; and they determined to restore it to soundness and health. They felt no confidence in the zeal of their rulers, though they deeply revered their office. They could hope but little from the apathy of their brethren; less from the coldness of their people. Yet they determined to overcome all these obstacles, to win over the bishops, to arouse the clergy, and to enlighten the laity. They resolved to bring back their doctrines and their worship, but still more the devotion and the piety of the nation, to ancient and pure models. It was a chivalrous and noble-hearted resolution, which could not but bring down many blessings on those who undertook it. And they never thought that it was to be carried into execution by folding up their arms, or biding their time, or rather the time of a possible Providence. They knew that they must work, if they wanted results; that they must begin by sowing seed, if they wished to gather fruit. And generously and vigorously they set to work. All was activity, energy, untiring industry. They employed every tried means of acting on the public mind; the press,—daily, weekly, monthly, and quarterly; they sent out unperiodical tracts, serials, and libraries; they grasped such extensive schemes as the translation of all the Fathers, and even of the abstruse scholastics of the middle ages. They were busy at college, in convocation, in parliament, in society; and for a time it did look as if the Establishment was a-stir; and its long stagnant pool seemed moved by an agitation which might be healing. And so indeed it proved to those who early and boldly cast themselves into the perilous waters.

But all this subsided. In many respects the work proved vain, and it was abandoned as hopeless. Its principal agents received a blessed reward: for the grace which they wished to impart to others fell back copiously on their own souls; and they exchanged the barren earth, which they had laboured in vain to till, for the rich soil of the Church, which will yield them fruit a hundredfold. Those who remained behind, and on whom the task of leadership in "the movement" naturally devolved, have abandoned all to which they seemed pledged, have clearly turned their backs on those first principles which guided them; and from the briskness of an extraordinary activity have sunk into a studied inertness and a satisfied acquiescence, which they would fain persuade us is the truer way to the same end. Anything more pitiable and more distressing in minds with which one has felt sympathy, we can hardly conceive. For to a Catholic it presents the fearful thought of a grace lost, and the time of mercy allowed to escape, and the awful delusions fallen into, which keep men ever after in a hopeless darkness.

But, apart from such gloomy considerations, the fact is so; and the work before us gives us melancholy evidence of it. Its sermons reach over a long period of time, but with them we have no inclination nor intention to deal. We mean to confine our remarks entirely to the "Preface on the present position of English churchmen." It is indeed a remarkable document, and may be considered as embodying the last theory of High-churchism, and the principles by which its guides mean to rule it. "A movement" we can no longer call it, for the theory, if it must have a name, should have one descriptive of stagnation, not of motion; the Dead Sea, not the flowing stream, must be henceforth its symbol. The object of Mr. Keble's Preface may be briefly stated in his own words.

"A dutiful person in the English church, we will suppose, has in some way been made aware of the sayings and feelings of good Roman Catholics concerning her; and with the fact, that some of those sayings meet with more or less countenance in antiquity; or he has come to be greatly impressed with the sanctity and other attractions undeniably existing in the communion of Rome, and the thought begins to haunt him, 'What if her exclusive claim be true? What if it should prove, that as yet I have been living without the pale of Christ's kingdom?'

"How is he to deal with such misgivings? Shall he suppress them with a strong hand, as he would impure or murderous thoughts?"—p. 3.

Mr. Keble assents to this proposal; and after supporting it by some arguments, proceeds as follows.

"For reasons like these, a person would not seem blameable, perhaps we might well judge his course the most reasonable of any, who should bring himself to reject all scruples concerning our church with a strong moral abhorrence, as he would any other evil imagination. But it is not every one, perhaps, who could bring himself to do so; and many, moreover, being more or less answerable for others, may be bound in charity to consider the special matter of their misgivings, and to be provided with some sufficient solution of them; sufficient, I mean, to direct a simple man's practice, not necessarily sufficient to silence an acute man's objections."—p. 5.

Here, then, we come to the real subject to be treated: how is an Anglican to act, who, troubled by doubts, in himself or others, finds it necessary to face them? Mr. Keble proposes the remedy, based upon Butler's Analogy; consisting of a series of general motives that shall stifle all enquiry, pacify all scruples, and make the anxious one sit down contented in the very slough of his despond. It supersedes all investigations of doctrine, all weighing of claims, all thought of the past, primitive or mediæval, fathers or councils, examples of holiness, or saintly teaching; it extinguishes all hopes of a higher standard and of a greater perfection; it substitutes for all these a conviction of optimism in the actual position of the individual and of all around him, which forbids his stirring a step for fear of breaking the charm. The English churchman, of a peculiar caste, is to consider himself as put exactly in the right place, and there he must stay without thinking of moving, lest he contravene a providential disposition. Our impression, upon reading this theory, was, that we could not better describe it than as a dogmatical quietism,* in which all action of the mental powers is to be suspended in the individual, and his religion is to consist in the passive acceptance of as much or as little doctrine, as much or as little practical observance, as the peculiarity of his situation allots him for his portion. But, before en-

* We have since been informed, that Mr. K. has occupied himself with the works of the French quietists. If so, we need not be surprised at the judgment to which he has come.

tering upon a more detailed examination of Mr. Keble's theory, we must observe, that his preface is written throughout in that kindly, mild, and humble tone, which makes us respect and even love the author, while we deprecate his views. We should, indeed, be sorry to set down one word which could be interpreted as harsh or unfriendly; and still more shall we regret, if any phrase of ours should appear to insinuate a suspicion of his uprightness and sincerity.

We object *in limine* to the use made of Butler's mode of reasoning from the analogy of nature in a matter of this kind. Wherever the argument is directed to draw the mind from a lower to a higher step in religious progress, we may admit this process. But when once we are at the highest point, and have to determine between two sides of a question, purely dependant upon a manifestation of a Divine decision, analogy can have no voice, except as further illustrating and strengthening what by other means is known to be true. For example, an infidel may have his objections to revelation removed by proving that they equally apply to natural and self-evident truths; or, by analogies from nature, &c. The Jew may have his difficulties on the New Testament answered by analogies from the Old; and the person who denies any church government, may be brought to respect it and find it by analogies from both. But a mystery like the Trinity, or a gift like the Eucharist, is so out of the sphere of all human conception and human interpretation, that the attempt to bring in analogy as first and fundamental proof, would be at once profane and absurd. Once prove them, and illustrations may be found in the speculations of philosophers and the longings of the human race. Now, the method proposed by Mr. Keble is to bring the reasoning by analogy into the dominion of pure faith, and make a series of doubtful and doubting possibilities become the groundwork of action in a matter of eternal import. Throughout, his reasonings are couched in such expressions as, "may it not be?" "is it not possible?" and he himself is sensible of this. For he says:—

"'Possibly,' 'perhaps,' 'why should it not be so,' these and other like forms of speech sound strangely cold and unmeaning to young and ardent spirits," &c.—p. 10.

And he defends this mode of arguing as follows:

"Yet a little consideration will make it obvious, that by thus excepting probabilities and analogies, men are indefinitely narrowing the reach and extent of faith as a principle of action. They are limiting it to a few great and trying moments and occasions, whereas it is clearly spoken of in scripture, as the mainspring of our ordinary life. For how few, comparatively, are the instances in which men are able to act without any doubt or misgiving at all, or any notion that something may be said on both sides? Now all but such cases, on the hypothesis now mentioned, are taken out of the province of faith."—p. 11.

It would appear, then, that Mr. Keble divides Faith between objects of two different classes, the certain and the only probable. This basis of his whole reasoning we must pronounce uncatholic and false. Faith can only comprise such truths as have been specifically made its objects. In the Catholic Church these are definite and precise. Bossuet, Veron, Holden, or any divine professing to enumerate and circumscribe dogmatic truths, can do so with perfect accuracy. If we suppose a wide region of probabilities besides which form part of the dominion of Faith, it follows that the Faith of one person will be wider than that of another; and as the portion which rests on probability will not rest on authority, but upon proofs, it will follow, that each individual will be left to exercise his private judgment upon a great portion of what he believes as of Faith. Or else he will hold the theory of intuition, and of inward impulses of a guiding Spirit, which leads to a no less danger, but which, throughout, seems more akin to Mr. Keble's views.

The admission therefore of analogy, especially from nature, as a dogmatical proof, still more as a ground of satisfaction and inertness, is based upon an erroneous and inadmissible theory of Faith. Once allow this to be certain and definite, and free from misgivings, (as it is with every Catholic), and there is no room for such a mode of enquiry. Besides, there is no knowing to what extent such reasoning might be pushed. For example, a savage, on being urged to belief in the Trinity, might reply, if capable of Dr. Butler's reasoning and Mr. Keble's application of it, "that it was 'safer' for him to remain in ignorance of such knowledge; because God had left him so. And as the same Providence which had thus acted in his regard, had withheld from him the knowledge of astro-

nomical truths, which the Europeans possessed, and yet enabled him to be perfectly happy, and skilful in knowing seasons and times without them, so he must suppose that one class of ignorance was as becoming for him as the other, and that some other mode of supplying the one had been provided for him, (in his own religion), as it had been done for him in the other." He might indeed be told, that it was "safer" to embrace a system which provided for eternity, than persevere in one which did not. But he might reply, that he believed in a future state, the happiness of which depends upon moral conduct, and not on belief, and tried to order his life for the securing of it. And after Mr. Keble's enfeebling of the principle of dogmatic Faith, and his strong advocacy of mere moral grounds of action in choosing "the safer way," and his urging of generous or confiding conduct for securing it, we do not see how such an unbeliever could be consistently urged further.

We now come to the main scope of Mr. Keble's Preface. It is to show that, whatever amount of argument, or attraction, there may be in favour of the Catholic Church, an Anglican chooses "the safer way," by remaining in his own Establishment. This term, "safer way," Mr. Keble will not allow us to apply to that homely old-fashioned argument, which has led many to serious reflection, and not a few into the Church, viz.: that while Hooker and other Anglicans admit our Religion to be a safe way to eternal life, Catholic divines do not allow the same privilege to *theirs*: so that a Catholic has his safety confessedly admitted by both sides, and an Anglican bases his, only on the claims of his own. This line of argument, Mr. Keble rejects, as "cold, dry, and hard," as "reminding one rather of a dexterous diplomatist insisting on the literal terms of a treaty, than of a loyal and affectionate son and subject, committing himself unreservedly to the King and Father of all." (p. 15.) And yet our Blessed Saviour has been pleased more than once, to teach us, that eternal salvation is to be made a matter of calculation, however "cold, dry, and hard" this may seem. He compares it to the work of a man about to build, who sits down coolly to make his estimates, and balance accounts, before he begins; to a king, who before going to war, calculates his strength, and prefers a "treaty" to a conflict. He approves of the activity of

servants who put their talents to account, and *trade* with them, (a very "cold, dry, and hard" occupation), to make profit by them: nor is there anything in that parable which authorizes us to conclude, that, if the servant who buried his money, instead of his irreverent plea, had said: "'I commit myself unreservedly' to Thee, as a tender Master, and trust to Thy goodness to receive back the talent given me, just as I got it," he would have been answered by: "Well done, thou good and faithful servant." Again, what are innumerable parables, as of him who sold all to buy a pearl; and of the steward who feared to lose his place; and of the woman who diligently counted her money, and searched with broom and lantern for her one lost coin; and of the five prudent virgins, who would not share their oil: what, we ask, are these but so many lessons of activity, prudence, and we might almost say, sharpness, in looking after our eternal welfare; intimations, to use a homely phrase, that "we must have our wits about us," if we intend to work our way to eternal life, among the difficulties and hindrances that stay us? And in that other parable, of the men sent to work in a vineyard, does not the good man of the house (who represents our Lord Himself) "*remind us of one insisting on the literal terms of a treaty?*" In fine, throughout the Gospel, which is the more frequently urged upon us—this unreserved confidence, which precludes all trouble of inquiry, or that prudence which omits no precaution of safety? For the former we do not find any encouragement; whereas the prudent householder who chooses a solid foundation, who watches his house with arms in his hands, who comes in at any hour to surprise his servants, and rewards them only if watchful, who ought to be ever on the look out for when thieves may come, who has in his stores old things and new to bring into use in proper time, he is the character most frequently put before us, as the type of what we should be in religious matters, vigorous, active, energetic, persevering, with every sense awake, and every power stretched, and every nerve strained to the work of salvation. These images are indeed simple and home-spun, drawn from every day life; but this very fact shows that they were meant to be practical, universal, and to form the staple of christian life. And the epistles represent to us the same character; the reasoning powers appealed to, and the judgment called in to

exercise itself even on sublime truths:* there certainly is no idea in them of that suspension of spiritual animation, to which Mr. Keble's theory would necessarily lead. Nor does there seem to be any reason for supposing that the Almighty, who has given to man judgment and reason, will not hold him responsible for the use of those faculties, as much as for the right application of every other gift. And if a man be placed in such a position, as that reasoning and judgment are the means whereby he is to be extricated from grievous error, he must be responsible for their right use. Now, short of an infallible guidance, every system may be erroneous; and any theory of religion, which on one side admits of possibility of error, and on the other condemns enquiry, is not only inconsistent but awfully perilous.

But now let us see the means by which Mr. Keble suggests that a member of the Anglican establishment may stave off all enquiry, and mesmerise into a profound sleep his awakened judgment and his alarmed conscience. First then,

"Being by supposition incompetent to decide upon masses of direct evidence, which these systems severally allege, we look to analogy for further help in determining 'the safe way;' and we find it altogether confirming the impression to which unbiassed instinct would lead us, viz., that the world being under moral government, the 'safe way' in uncertain cases must be that which is most agreeable to the duties we are before certain of. 'He that is willing to do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God.'"—p. 16.

Mr. Keble's illustration of this principle is, that a man could not receive baptism if he had no means of receiving

* There is one text of St. Paul, which is constantly brought forward in this sort of controversy, and we see that Mr. Keble employs it, (p. 43.) It is 1 Cor. viii. 20. "Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called." This is interpreted to mean, that therefore a man is bound to remain contented in that religion in which he has been brought up. Now it is plain, that if so, to those whom St. Paul addressed, such an interpretation could not have occurred, unless so as to mean, that the Jew was to remain a Jew, and the heathen a heathen, for there were as yet no branch churches. But St. Paul himself explains his meaning sufficiently in the context. "Wast thou called (to christianity,) being a bondsman? Care not for it." It is very unfair to press this text into the service of the "non-enquiry theory."

it, without confessing a crime of which he was really innocent. Now this is certainly an extreme case, yet not unprovided with a remedy, in *baptismo flaminis*, in baptism by desire. It supposes a man called on not merely to break through a duty that is subordinate, but to tell a lie, that is, commit what under *no* circumstances could be allowed. But there is a more practical and intelligible way of putting this principle to the test. Let us suppose a dissenter invited to join Anglicanism, or an Anglican inclined to Catholicity. He knows antecedently his duty to his parents, and he knows that the step will greatly afflict them, perhaps bring down on him their indignation. Is this previous knowledge of a moral duty to suffice for quenching all further enquiry, and making him satisfied that it would be wrong to go further? If not, then the test, as a principle for ordinary cases, breaks down. But if even in this case the moral consideration could justify the stifling of all enquiry, then what becomes of the declarations of our Saviour, that He had come to bring not peace but the sword, and to separate a man from his parents, and on the possibility of love for parents having to be put in the balance against the following or loving Him, and having to be outweighed? Mr. Keble proceeds with another example as follows:

"Cases again may be conceived affecting practice, in which the seeming logical or historical evidence may tell almost wholly on one side, yet it may be clearly right to prefer the other, by reason of some moral instinct, which comes in and will not let itself be unfelt. Suppose a man's parent accused of any great crime, let the amount of apparent proof against him be never so overwhelming, none will deny that it is the child's duty, come what will, to disbelieve his guilt if he can; to give him the benefit not only of reasonable doubt, but of any the faintest and remotest possibility of innocence, and to act accordingly, disregarding all personal consequences. Now this is but one out of a thousand instances, wherein the moral sense is mercifully empowered to correct the errors of the intellect, or supply its imperfections. Few in comparison are judges of evidence, but all may listen to the inward voice, directing them in such matters to the safer side."—p. 17.

Here is again a palpable fallacy. If the evidence in this case be overwhelming, it is as much so for the culprit's unfortunate child, as for any third or indifferent party. It could not be any more "an error or imperfection of the intellect" in one than in the other, to come to the same

conclusion. The natural instinct, seconded by religious affection, would indeed come in mercifully, to *blunt* the intellect and *deadens* the force of proof, but certainly not to correct it. No one would consider a son an impartial, or fair, nor consequently, a just judge, in the case of a parent. But to what does this example amount? Why to this, that it will require a greater weight of evidence to convince a dutiful child, than another person, of the parent's guilt, not that he never can be convinced. For after all, too many children grow up in the sad conviction that their father has justly forfeited his life for a grievous crime. And there may be cases like that of Joas and Athalia, in which a son may have to consent to act fearfully on that conviction. Applying, therefore, this illustration, as it is clear Mr. Keble intends, to the position of an Anglican, we must conclude, that in proportion to his love for his system, and his filial attachment to its governors, will be the difficulty of convincing him that he is wrong. These feelings, or instincts, will be thrown, unconsciously perhaps, and in various shapes, into the balance against us. But there may be a point at which the scale will turn, and conviction will carry the day against instinct, however respectable. It is when evidence is so overwhelming as to overcome feeling, that the triumph of truth takes place, and those demonstrations of the power of grace in the gospel dispensation, over the most sacred of instincts and attachments, above alluded to, are exhibited in conversion.

Such are the preliminaries of Mr. Keble's grounds for remaining in communion with Anglicanism, and overbalancing arguments in favour of abandoning it. He now proposes five motives for this purpose, which he himself sums up as follows :

"On the whole, we have enumerated *five* points, in which the moral sense may come in to determine 'the safest way,' whether in aid or in default of historical or abstract reasoning, or in some cases even against it. We may ask ourselves, which of two decisions is more in unison, first, with contentment; secondly, with intellectual modesty; thirdly, with contrition; fourthly, with love of sanctity in others; fifthly, with fear of giving offence."—p. 21.

These motives will not be thus easily understood. But their application is as follows. An Anglican, by remaining in his religion, is in the state which best favours the exercise of these five virtuous feelings: by leaving it, he loses in their regard. Any one else joining that system

loses nothing of them, but has all to gain. We must however explain a little more fully what these terms mean.

First, *contentment*. Let there be on one side a great array of arguments, on the other the simple principle, "*quieta non movere*,"—"I am where God has seen fit to place me," &c. The latter ought to prevail "until you discern *unequivocal* manifestations of God's will calling you out of it." (p. 19.)

This motive is strong in favour of remaining in Anglicanism, because this, compared with Catholicity, is a homely, humiliating condition, and there is more "generous contentment" in remaining in such a state, than there can be in one more glorious and inviting. (p. 26.)

It is not applicable to others (not however Catholics) called to join the Anglican communion—Jews, for instance; because they have to give up nothing, but only add to former belief, while Anglicans to become Catholics, have to give up what they have accounted to be a real participation in Christ. (p. 56.)

Secondly, *intellectual modesty*. Religious arguments are weighty and difficult: there is more modesty in not affecting to grasp them—a wise self-distrust, which "is a temper so suitable to us and to our condition, that whatever course implies more of it, has so far a presumption in its favour." (p. 19.)

This belongs to the Establishment: because, by becoming a Catholic, a member of it pronounces on many and various propositions decided, under anathema, by the Roman Church, and leaves millions to be saved by invincible ignorance, or uncovenanted mercy. (p. 27.)

It does not hold where people are called to Anglicanism: because Jews and Turks, for instance, are not called upon to reason, but only to receive testimony! (p. 56.)

Thirdly, *contrition*. That system is to be preferred which has a tendency "to magnify, rather than extenuate faults." (p. 19.)

This is proved to be applicable in Anglicanism by a curious inversion of argument. The Roman Church, by denying to it sacramental grace, and doubting its baptisms, (not its baptism), "assuages a man's self-reproaching thoughts, with the notion that he has not grieved the Holy Spirit." Therefore there is more ground for contrition in the English system, where this thought will continue. (p. 29.)

It is not found in another religion. For example, a Baptist does not, on conforming, get rid of "bitter remembrances of post-baptismal sin. For it was never any tenet of his, that post-baptismal sin has any special aggravation." (p. 57.)

Fourthly, *love of sanctity in others.* This sufficiently explains itself. (p. 20.)

It exists in Anglicanism, inasmuch as, on leaving this, a man is called upon to deny the supernatural holiness of those whom he has loved and revered from his infancy as holy; and moreover whereas, while an Anglican, he could feel "interested in the Saints of the whole Church," he is required, on conversion, "to cast off all but the Roman." (p. 31.)

It is wanting in other bodies, so that they lose nothing of it on embracing Anglicanism. For, again, a Baptist has accounted holiness only as "a special token from God's sanctifying Spirit.....He has not counted it, as supposing himself a Catholic (Anglican) he would have done, a regular fruit of the Free Unspeakable Gift, vouchsafed in Baptism.....In that case, he must have been content to lower his estimate of it. But now nothing hinders, but that he may still think of it as he did; as of a token of mercy overflowing, an extraordinary favour, over and above the settled dispensations of grace." (p. 57.) Very subtle this; but is it practical reasoning?

Fifthly, *fear of giving offence.* This, again, is sufficiently clear; it is fear of scandal. (p. 21.)

It is to be seen in Anglicanism, because one leaving it may have to answer for causing pain, and anxiety, and "wavering of the imagination in prayer" to others; and, perhaps, for unsettling their principles, and leading them to scepticism. (p. 32.)

But not in other systems, which have only to change opinions, not principles, so that the scandal is much less. (p. 59.)

We have brought together the *disjecta membra* of Mr. Keble's motives or grounds for remaining in the Anglican communion, in the face of arguments, scruples, and almost goadings of conscience. For, if a man can make up his mind to decide the momentous questions which involve salvation upon such grounds as these, we can easily imagine him fearfully racked and tormented before he subside into quiet indifference; although this may be

called a generous confidence. We have stated our author's reasoning as fairly as we could: and we believe that our readers will be astonished, and hold it little less than infatuation, in a good and able man, to propose it for general acceptance. We will confine our remarks on these motives within as reasonable a compass as we can.

1. The entire system bears on it the sure stamp of error in religion,—novelty. From the beginning of the Church to the present hour, there has been an unceasing conflict between the ONE Church, as she always called herself, and numerous bodies, which she considered in error. There have been a number of learned and holy men engaged in arguing on the one side, and no want of ability on the other. And yet, until now—until Butler's "Analogy" has become popular—until Mr. Keble has found that reasoning almost invariably leads to the abandonment of the Establishment, such a simple mode of putting an end to controversy has never been found. Or, if it has any parallel in ancient and venerable times, it can only be in the reasoning of those heretics, who assumed to themselves particular guidance, or claimed marks of Divine favour towards their system. Donatism in what regards "contentment," Novatianism in respect to "contrition," and others, on other heads, might have used similar reasoning. But, certainly, on the Catholic side it has been unknown till now.

2. The reason of this is clear, and bears its own condemnation. Mr. Keble himself acknowledges, that it is not a course for the whole Church, but only for the Anglican "branch:" not even for all this, but for the little bough that has sprung from it, under the name of High-churchism. He is treating only of "the line which Divine Providence seems to have marked out for us English Catholics," (p. 24.) i. e. Anglicans. Then in the next paragraph he narrows this to "the position of an *English Churchman of the Anglo-Catholic school*," which he considers, "in many respects peculiarly fitted to form and prove this part of the Christian character," (p. 25.) that is, contentedness. We are therefore called upon to admit the startling proposition, that a special mode of satisfactory evidence, before unknown, has been vouchsafed to what is commonly called Puseyism, or particular views in a national (so-called) Church. We never heard anything certainly that sounded more like a plea for heresy in our

lives. It supposes a fractional portion, of a system rejected by the rest of the Church, to have been so taken under the peculiar guidance of a superintending Providence, that its followers have been furnished with a special form of evidence, and a particular mode of being convinced, which belongs (at least in equal measure) to none other. This little flock is taken out of the ordinary rules, whereby the minds of men have been guided and ruled, till now, in regard to religious truths; and has received instead, a series of moral principles or instincts, which have to take their place, and make it satisfied with what it has, irrespectively of its being true or false. It alone is exempted from reasoning, or examination of evidence, without the plea of infallibility, or even of certainty.

Now against all this we have two further objections. First, so extraordinary a privilege ought surely to have manifestations, *ab extra*. In other words, the "Anglo-Catholic school" of "the English Church" being so favoured by God, must be intended to draw all that establishment into itself, so as to cease to be a school; and further to gain the whole of the Catholic Church to its communion. Its motto should be, "Fear not, little flock, for it hath well pleased your Father to give unto you the kingdom." It is impossible to imagine a religious section so specially favoured and endowed from above, merely for the sake of those who happen to be already in it; but the same peculiar favours must be meant to extend to others. Our blessed Saviour prayed, not only for his apostles, but for all those likewise who through them should come to believe. A merciful God must therefore wish that many more should partake of the new blessings which He has, in these later days, granted to one favoured body. But how is this to be, unless there are evidences, external to the minds and consciences of the individual, of the existence of this favour? It is true Mr. Keble has put them forth in this Preface, but he appeals, as we shall see, to *internal proof* only: and *experience* is their only test. These cannot exist anteriorly to joining the society.

But since this privilege belongs to the "High-Church" school, and every "Low-Churchman" is called necessarily to partake of it, let us see how he might or must apply Mr. Keble's own tests. 1st. As to *contentment*, "if there is special merit in remaining in the High-Church body, beyond going to Catholicism, *because* the

former is so much more unattractive, less splendid in its services, 'a smaller and comparatively disunited body,' &c., (p. 25), there must be still greater merit of contentment in remaining with the Low-Church, where all these disadvantages are ten-fold greater." 2nd. As to *intellectual modesty*, "how can I pretend to weigh the arguments respecting the sense of subscription and true meaning of the Articles, and the disputes on the Rubric and Prayer-book; how can I unravel the *Catena Patrum*, or pierce the cloud of witnesses, or decide betwixt conflicting charges of bishops? I had better remain 'content with such as I have;' 'I am where God has seen fit to place me,' &c., and therefore I will content myself with what I am." 3rd. As to *contrition*, "I feel that admitting sacramental helps to forgiveness, and seeking the relief of confession, and the comfort of absolution, would in part fill up that depth of sorrow, and diminish that total reliance on God's mercy, which now enter into my grief for sin." 4th. As to *love of sanctity*, "I am now in a position to sympathize with all evangelical Christians, and to rejoice in the success of their missionary labours, and their awakening of people's conscience: whereas on becoming a High-Churchman, I must give them all up, and look on them as heretics and out of covenanted mercies." And 5th. As to *scandal*, "the embracing of Anglo-Catholic ceremonies and doctrines, causes great offence among those of my connexion, equal to what would be inflicted by my going over to Popery." A Low-Churchman or evangelical Anglican, could thus apply these tests against joining the High-Church school of theology, and thus be cut off from the privileges belonging to it, under a special Providence. Now, as has been observed, this system, if so guided, ought to have such external evidence as would draw others to itself.

But secondly, independent of this demonstration for the benefit of others, it should be furnished with such ordinary proof as may be required from every religious system. It should have a ground in clear declarations of Scripture, or in the symbols, or in some decree of a Council, or in the Anglican Articles, or in the Prayer-book; or somewhere where men naturally go to learn the grounds of their faith. But there is nothing of this to be had: the whole is based upon Mr. Keble's applications of Butler's analogy. Surely this is not enough to satisfy people that such a

theory comes of God, or has been approved by Him, so that thereon they may emperil their eternal salvation!

3. But, however, Mr. Keble does claim a Divine sanction for his system of motives; and it does indeed grieve us sorely to have to state it. It is another of the many proofs of a popular adage—that “extremes meet.” After objecting to himself, that it is easy to select similar motives in favour of any cause; he answers the difficulty in the following over-earnest tone.

“But really the matter is too serious to be disposed of by any such general remark. Let those who are inclined so to deal with it, ask themselves as in the presence of Almighty God, whether these and other like considerations, *have not indeed been chosen out for their trial, not by any human pleader, but by His Providence, so that they cannot be neglected, or scornfully overruled without profane disregard of Him.*” p. 23.

We do unfeignedly regret to see this end of the greatest movement in favour of true religious guidance and principle, ever excited in the Anglican establishment. We deplore indeed this verification of past experience, and this terrible proof that there is no “safe way” out of the Church; on seeing those very men, who rose up boldly against the exercise of private judgment, and in favour of high dogmatic principle, now come down not only to that very judgment as the basis of religious conviction, but appealing to its exercise by the individual, in that form in which it is most dangerous, and which they would have most strongly reprobated; and making this uncatholic principle the basis of communion with the Church. For it is clear that Mr. Keble, first, grounds his motives upon a direct manifestation of them by God to the individual; secondly, that he considers such a declaration so certain and binding as that its neglect is a “profane disregard” of God. Now it is through the imagination of course that such feelings or apparent convictions may come, and if we once admit their existence in doctrinal guidance—if we once allow that, in a particular body, God speaks to the individual directly, and gives him his proper motives for belonging to it, making his conviction of its safety depend upon such a communication, we do not see what more the most fanatical dissenter can desire in the way of concession of his own principles. The Anabaptists of Germany, the Cromwellian Puritans in England, or the Mormonites in America, can desire nothing

more. And if we add to this, the species of illumination apparently claimed by, and conceded to, some of the present rulers of High-churchism, the sort of extra-episcopal, or supra-primalial jurisdiction exercised unscrupulously by them, and the unfearing assumption of dogmatism and dictation of duty which they practice, in other words the bold leadership which they undertake in matters of faith and conscience, we are brought to feel that to the points of resemblance above mentioned, with ancient heresies, we may add a more painful one still in this system, in these indications of practical Montanism. When we consider the wonderful transition of a mind like Tertullian's from the principles of the *Præscriptiones* to the weakness of that delusion, we may be the less amazed at the fall, from the high tone of the "Tracts for the Times," to this miserable appeal to supernatural individual guidance. But we dismiss this distressing subject, and proceed.

4. We must further object to Mr. Keble's system, that its illustration is conducted, no doubt unconsciously, by a most complete course of special pleading. Having laid down general principles, they should have been tested by general applications. Instead of this we have particular cases, varied to suit each point, and no others. Thus, for the first two, we have the case proposed of Jews or Turks coming over to Christianity—a very rare and impractical one, and not calculated to give light on a matter of choice between two systems of Christianity. But they are chosen in part, to make out that "intellectual modesty" cannot hold with them, because they have to yield to testimony, not to demonstration: as though testimony delivered nearly two thousand years ago did not require much the same process for arriving at its certainty, as the settling of a doctrinal principle. Again, the Baptist is chosen to prove what is perhaps applicable to him alone of all Christians. But the whole argument, it will be seen, is wanting in simplicity, is far-fetched, and not like either a plain or a safe way.

5. It must be clear to any Catholic reader, that such grounds as Mr. Keble proposes, instead of inviting any one in communion with the Church to leave it for "the Anglo-Catholic school," would apply with tenfold strength to him, as motives for remaining where he is. We need not go again through all the points at length; but certainly there is more ground for contentedness where there

is so much room for gratitude, which a good Catholic daily feels for his position: there is more religious modesty in shrinking from condemning the Church of the whole world, and from abandoning the Church of the Saints, for a partial and local division; there is better hope of contrition where penance is daily preached and regularly practised as a sacrament; there is more love of sanctity, where every day throughout the year the saints are proposed as models and objects of admiration, and the communion of saints is a practical doctrine; and certainly there is more danger of scandal from a Catholic's apostatising, than from a change in any one else; for the latter happens daily and no one thinks much of it; but if a Catholic, especially a priest, abandons his Church, it is talked of, and loudly proclaimed, and he is made a great deal of for a time by those whom he joins.

But we must not be content with this. The moral grounds on which a Catholic will hold to his religion, independent of theological ones, must have two characters, which are wanting in those proposed by Mr. Keble. First, they must be real and operative, not existing solely in instinct and feelings. Thus, for example, "love of holiness" must not be merely the affection for the quality in others, but the love of its practical diffusion. A Catholic might say, "I see in my Church a true love of holiness in children, shown by their careful education, their early training in works of piety, the jealous guard over the purity of their minds, and by the multitude of religious orders devoted to their instruction in morals." And looking at what he knows to be the mode of continuing this education in colleges and ecclesiastical seminaries on one side, and what he may read and hear of public schools and universities on the other, he may come easily to a practical conclusion as to where real "love of sanctity" is to be found. Again, he might consider "love of holiness" as exhibited in the desire to spread its practice among the poor: as, for instance, seeing in every ward of a Catholic hospital an altar and daily mass, and no patient allowed to die without viaticum and extreme unction: observing how diligently and effectually the poorest are trained to penitent confession of their sin, and how they are strengthened with the sacraments at the hour of death. He may further reckon the many appliances of holiness for every class, in "Spiritual Exercises," in missionary preaching, in confraterni-

ties, in meditation, in devotions to our Lord, His Passion, and His perpetual presence in the Eucharist, in frequent and even daily communion, in the religious life, and in the countless ministrations of spiritual charity. Surely the possession of all this in a religion must be a far more powerful evidence of "love of holiness" existing in it, and throughout it, than the mere abstract supposition, that an Anglican can love the holiness of a Catholic Saint, but a Catholic cannot on principle love the virtue of an Anglican. Nor indeed will this assertion hold. We are not aware that any Englishman has ever yet pushed the pretensions of his establishment, so far as to put its bishops into competition of holiness with St. Charles Borromeo, St. Francis of Sales, or St. Thomas of Villanova: or any of its clergy with St. Philip Neri, St. Ignatius, or St. Francis Xavier; its philanthropists with St. John of God, St. Joseph Calasancius, St. Camillus, or St. Vincent: its holy women with St. Teresa, St. Rose, or St. Veronica. All these have lived in a communion with the Roman Church, which they would not have given up to save their lives; and true admiration or love of these great characters, implies approbation of the principles which formed them, and these principles were those of the "Roman" or "Popish" Church in their fullest extent, including abhorrence of the very schism which, according to Mr. Keble, now claims them as objects of love. A Catholic then, who believes that all that they believed and all they did was holy and sprung from a principle of holiness, may truly love them. But an Anglican, who must condemn them in many things, yea, and mostly in the very things which *they* most loved, cannot truly be said to love their holiness. Then again, if these present standards of holiness, on the other side there may be great and amiable virtues, but not more; and these a Catholic can love and admire in any one, and will bear testimony to them in an Anglican bishop, or in whomsoever they may be found.

But further, the evidences of active "love of sanctity" in the Catholic Church, are not confined to the observation of one within its pale, but start up to the eyes of any beholder who stands without. Indeed, they are acknowledged, sometimes they are coveted and envied. Even those who choose to consider them as the workings of a pernicious activity, bear testimony to their existence. It is not, therefore, wonderful if many, indeed if most, of those who join the Church,

are drawn thither by the moral evidence thus presented to them, than by mere dogmatic conviction. A sister of charity may be but a poor reasoner, and yet she may be a powerful argument. A visit of a priest to a dying man in the hospital, often converts the tenant of the next bed, though he has not overheard a word. One attendance at benediction of the most blessed Sacrament, has made those who came to scoff, remain to pray and to adore, though there was no sermon. We have heard of the heir to a peerage being converted, merely by seeing his poor Irish countrymen hearing mass exposed to the rain, on the bleak edge of the bog. Such is the working of this moral motive, "love of sanctity," in the Catholic Church—it is a powerful bond to the Church for those who belong to it, and it is a demonstration that convinces, often at first sight, those that seek for truth.

We would gladly go through some of the other grounds suggested by Mr. Keble, and show how much more powerfully they tell in favour of the Catholic Church in both these senses. But we think we are spared this trouble by his own acknowledgments. For at p. 54, he seems to put aside the question of a Catholic's having to leave *his* Church, and the applicability of the five motives to the purpose of restraining him, as not being to his readers "an immediate practical point;" and contents himself with showing, that they are not good ground for justifying the remaining in dissent. But more than this, Mr. Keble seems to acknowledge that in the face of these grounds for fidelity to Anglicanism, there may be an overwhelming and divine call to abandon it. The following is the passage to which we allude:

"Now what is the result of such a feeling as this, on a modest and thoughtful mind? Plainly to render a man more easily contented with his place, more willing to hope and wait with patience, as having a right to reckon certainly upon a great deal of unconscious sympathy, and virtual communion in divine offices, on the part of those even who esteem themselves most alienated from him. But suppose the same person once made aware that, in order to stay where he is, he must contradict something which has been held as an axiom by the mass of believers from time immemorial; some rule, so to call it, of the common law of the christian kingdom, this is surely another case altogether. The providential call on such an one to consider where he is, and why, becomes much more direct; and the possible sacrifice, if as great or greater, yet more evidently worth making."—p. 63.

What does this mean, but that under given circumstances all the motives and feelings described in the Preface may be overbalanced by some still stronger; and that an Anglican may have a Providential call to sacrifice them all, and embrace what is proposed to him? Now, putting aside this theoretical system of individual Providential calls, apart from the working of grace to second ordinary modes for arrival at truth, this admission destroys, to our minds, the whole theory. For if we really allow the existence of objective truth in religion, a *Providential* call, which draws away a soul from its actual convictions to others directly opposed to them, must be considered a call from error to truth. The supposition of the opposite would be sheer blasphemy. Now if we consider that the movement from Anglicanism to Catholicity almost invariably, and necessarily involves losses of every sort, in a worldly sense, and puts on new burthens and restraints, whereas almost every imaginable motive conspires with the natural *vis inertiae* of the mind to keep the Anglican in his place, it does not seem difficult to decide which alone can be the true, and which the simulated call. The difference with us is this. As an ordinary case, we never feel, or hear of, a call to leave our Church: but all possible motives urge us to stay where we are. We therefore are not called to make this discernment of spirits, and balance between a possible Providential call to remain in the Church, and one to abandon it. But the moment such a conflict is admitted as probable, or even possible, we must conclude that the theory is inadmissible to this extent; that a real call can only be in one direction, and that the call in the other can only be a delusion. Now the rules of ordinary judgments in things spiritual, will give us easy criterions for determining which is one and which the other. The side which self-love, indolence, fear of persecution or ridicule, national prejudices, those of education, authority of those whom we love, dislike of giving offence, pride which shrinks from danger, repugnance to self-condemnation, the side, we say, which these and such like feelings would naturally, and without further bias would bear to, and seek to justify, must be the suspicious one; and a "Providential call" which runs parallel with, and seconds such corrupt tendencies, may be well put away as an illusion. On the other hand, symptoms of a "Providential call," which would lead us

to become as little children and learn our catechism over again, to revise our past lives and account our former wisdom foolishness, which would present the cross at every turn and thorns on every footstep, which would "show us only what things we should have to suffer" for Christ's blessed sake—may not only be safely listened to, but may not be safely neglected. And if we are asked, in return, why Catholics may not have equally to go back upon the grounds of their adhesion to the Church, and make a similar comparison of motives? the reply is simple: "because we do not experience, nor admit, the existence of any such call. We remain where we are, because nothing ever invites us to leave our position. Our pastures are too pleasant for the flock to stray."

We have confined ourselves entirely to the reasoning pursued by Mr. Keble to justify an Anglican for rejecting enquiry, and remaining contented with his own sect, just as he finds it—that is, if he belong to the Anglo-Catholic, or High-church, school. We have totally omitted all notice of a large, and almost detached, portion of his Essay, which ranges from p. 33 to p. 54, because it enters directly into controversy on higher matters—such as the marks of the Church; and if it ever have to be examined, will require a full and separate notice. Perhaps, indeed, some abler hand may undertake the task, though not a difficult one. But there is an observation in the work, which brings us back to the regretful feelings with which we commenced this article. "Neither," writes Mr. Keble, "are providential hints wanting, especially calculated to keep us in our place at this time. The stir and movement for the better within our own walls, as if God had some especial work in store for us, has not quite passed away, as might have been feared." (p. 68.) *Has not quite passed away!* What a melancholy consolation for one who began "the stir and movement," not with a view that it *should* pass away, but that it should live and grow, and gather might. *Ignem veni mittere in terram, et quid volo nisi ut accendatur?* Was not this the bold, but sacred purpose of the agitation caused? Was it not to set the whole Establishment on fire with a holy flame of zeal and love? Was it on the principle of *quieta non movere*? or "What things a man has, with those let him be content," that animated Mr. Keble and his companions in making the movement and stir? And were they right? Then, these maxims

on which his present Essay is based, or towards which it converges, are not safe or fit ones in this matter. Were they wrong? Then, how can the continuance of the success of their efforts be a providential hint to guide their conduct? And if that activity, as blessed by God, is shown to be approved, how can a contrary course be now the safest one? We have seen, at the outset, that the movement in Anglicanism commenced by a mental activity and a persevering research, the very reverse of what Mr. Keble now advises. Is it not inconsistent to look at it, at one and the same time, as a providential action in the system, and as opposed to motives based upon providential workings?

But we sincerely hope, that there is now "a movement and a stir" within those walls to which Mr. Keble alludes, which will be a providential hint to many, *not* to stay in their place. While we have been perusing his Preface, there has been excited in the Establishment a turmoil which cannot fail to shake the acquiescence of many in providential positions. Almost at the very birth of this Review, "the Oxford Controversy" on Dr. Hampden afforded us an opportunity of examining into the position of the Anglican Establishment.* Mr. Keble's "Sermon on Primitive Tradition," now reprinted, presented us another text for an analogous subject.† We find it strange to see, after so many years, the same characters still before us; but in how reversed an attitude. Dr. Hampden, whose condemnation by High-Church power and vigour, gave us hope of a possible return to vitality in the establishment, exalted to the episcopal dignity; and Mr. Keble, a teacher in the school that condemned him, fallen to the advocacy of being content with things as they are, that is, as they were before the school arose. We should now, indeed, be sorry to interfere in the personal contest against the Regius Professor's nomination, or discuss his theological fitness for a mitre. Even allowing all that has been written against him, we do not see that sentence of exclusion can be pronounced against him. If the bench of bishops is to be assayed dogmatically, and none admitted to a seat thereon who cannot stand the ordeal, it might indeed prove a hard task to fix the standard of orthodoxy;

* No. I., p. 250.

† No. V., p. 45.

but Dr. Hampden would have equal right with others to the advantage of its vagueness. This, however, is not the question which interests *us*. The position and the prospects of High-Church principles and of their advocates, seem to be prominently brought out by what has occurred. We shall not close the year inopportunately by some reference to it.

At the moment then that we are writing, a great and truly important conflict exists between the civil and the ecclesiastical power in this kingdom. For the first time, we believe, not only in the memory of man, but for a century, the rulers of the establishment have openly and publicly objected to what they acknowledge to be an act of the supremacy, the appointment of a bishop. See after see has been filled up by prelates holding every variety of opinion, and no protest was ever made, no opposition ever raised. At length Dr. Hampden, who, less fortunate than other professors of theology, has been censured by the University of Oxford, raises a storm, which presents various interesting points of observation.

The first is the conflict of bishops. Twelve or thirteen occupiers of the episcopal bench, unite in an address to the prime minister, calling upon him to pause in his design, and not urge forward the proposed election. In a matter like this, unanimity in that body would have been of the utmost importance. A united episcopate in a matter so nearly affecting the doctrines of which it is the natural guardian, and the authority of which it ought to be the jealous keeper, might indeed have been obviously expected. But one half of the body is silent, and one or two speak boldly in opposition. Surely this looks like a house divided against itself.

The second is, the form of the proceedings. So serious a matter demanded surely some solemnity of ecclesiastical forms. Out of two archbishops, one at least might have headed the opposition, and put his signature to the condemnatory document. Both, however, have prudently refrained from acting. Then, we are given to understand by the documents published, that it is more in their private capacity, than as princes and shepherds of God's Church, that the bishops address the minister of the crown. In fact, as Lord John Russell truly informs them, they do not even take on themselves any responsibility of expressing an opinion, still less a judgment, in the matter;

but cast the whole burden on the clergy, giving their want of confidence in Dr. Hampden as the ground of their remonstrance. There is, indeed, a weakness in the mode of proceeding, which has given the prime minister a signal advantage over its authors.

The third point worthy of observation is the tone of every document, whether the joint address of the bishops, or Dr. Philpott's letter to Lord John Russell. The prerogative of supremacy is fully acknowledged, without the intimation of a remedial power in the hands of the poor Establishment. It is not anywhere hinted, that there is a line of assumption, which the state power must not presume to pass, and a line of duty, which no effort of its will ever induce the bishops to overstep. There is no setting forth of the doctrines of St. Chrysostom or St. Ambrose, on the true character of imperial and of episcopal power, when the two shall clash or be brought into conflict. A gentlemanly, orderly, quiet remonstrance, almost supplicative, from the hierarchy to a lay minister, without one great motive urged, or any argument from the law of God or of the Church, or a long argumentative wrestling with him, on the part of one of the bench—such are the grave ecclesiastical documents which posterity will find to record a struggle on the part of what calls itself the Church of, or in, England against the unjust exercise of a royal prerogative, similar to what made a St. Edmund or St. Anselm exiles, and a St. Thomas a martyr. But the days of heroes have long since passed away. The spirit of the Cross departs ever with its emblem.

On the other hand, the temporal minister of state deals with the bishops much as he would have done with a corn-law deputation. He seems to consider the matter a fair field for reasoning; and he enters into the arena, nothing loath. He combats them foot to foot—denies, one by one, every position which they lay down—considers himself quite as good a judge as they on the validity of dogmatical decisions of the Convocation—looks upon the whole question as one of prerogative, and intimates an opinion, that not reason, but clamour and prejudice, have raised this ecclesiastical storm. And on another occasion, more explicitly than on this, he intimates that the Establishment wants still more protestantizing, as though he considered it his duty to blend in just proportions the various ingredients of their religious system, and restore

the balance of opposite elements which rule in this most heterogeneous mass. Should the influx of latitude in dogmatic views, now introduced, turn too much the scale, it may become the duty of the prime minister to throw into the other side a bishop of decided Anglo-Catholic principles and feelings, and so further catholicize the Establishment. But we are inclined to believe, that it will be easier to protestantize, than to catholicize, it.

On the whole, the struggle is one that must interest us deeply. On its issue much must depend. If the government yield to the ecclesiastical pressure, it will have given an example of deference such as has not been witnessed since the Reformation; and we can well understand the use that will be made of it. But we do not anticipate such a result. We believe that another heavy blow and sad discouragement is in store for the Anglican Establishment, which may further undeceive too hopeful minds, and materially alter "the position of English Churchmen."

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

I.—*The History of the Penal Laws enacted against Roman Catholics*, by R. R. MADDEN, M. R. I. A., &c., &c. London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son, 1847.

THIS is a very valuable work—too valuable to be disposed of in so brief a notice as the present; and yet too important to permit its publication to pass without an observation, even though that observation be brief, and therefore insufficient and unsatisfactory. The evil work of the mis-called "Reformation" requires many commentators and many historians, in order that the hypocritical and false pretences on which it was founded may be known, and the pernicious consequences that followed from it sufficiently appreciated. A gigantic abomination, which robbed the poor to endow the rich, it has been praised by the flatterers and sycophants of the rich; because literature, until the present century, was an instrument in the hands of the wealthy; and no friend to the poor, and no advocate of their rights, could presume to

touch it, without being prepared for an *ex-officio* information, for ruinous fines, and murderous imprisonments. The undefined libel-law of England was the ægis of the distinctly defined Penal laws of England; and if the latter made martyrs who are now saints in heaven, the former created victims, and was careless as to their creed, if they evinced a love for truth, a desire to vindicate Catholicity from the calumnious aspersions cast upon it, and proved their determination to have the Catholics restored to those rights and franchises of which they had been unjustly deprived. Thus, the first honest Protestant historian, of the Protestant Reformation, William Cobbett, was branded and punished as a libeller: thus too, the Hunts, because they were favourable to Emancipation, were branded and punished as libellers: and such, too, was the fate in Ireland of the Protestant John Magee, the proprietor of the *Dublin Evening Post*; because he not only desired Catholic Emancipation, but had the courage to denounce the persecution to which Catholics in his day were subjected. It was in accordance with English "Reformation" law, and as it would seem, for the direct purpose of shielding and protecting the reformation itself, that the axiom grew in repute, however abhorrent it may be to man's notions of honour, candour, and justice, viz., that "the greater the truth the greater the libel."

To tell the truth of the Reformation in this country was a libel—punishable at one time as treason, at another as a misdemeanour; whilst to falsify facts, praise the wrongdoers, slander the wronged, calumniate the pious, and defame the virtuous, was profitable, and is still popular, or else literary hacks would not contaminate the shelves of circulating libraries with novels and romances, in which their depraved imaginations portray "plotting priests" and "murderous monks."

A new era has commenced in literature. The libel law is buried with the Anti-Catholic Ellenborough, Redesdale, and Eldon. Cobbett's good "History of the Reformation" has been succeeded by a better work from the pen of the Rev. I. W. Waterworth; and here we have from Dr. Madden a book, which is demonstrative of his zeal, his integrity, his unbending honesty and his untiring industry. The motive to all that Dr. Madden has done as a writer is an unquenchable love of truth—his talent consists in the accumulation of facts, no matter what may be the difficul-

ties or the impediments cast in his way to prevent his attainment of them. His arguments are facts—his inferences facts—and hence his work will be found invaluable to those who desire to know “the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth,” as to the Reformation and its consequences, both in England and in Ireland.

A portion of the history of his own country has been rescued from oblivion by Dr. Madden—that portion of it, which includes the sad events between 1797 and 1803. To enable him to place before the world *all the facts* connected with that part of Irish history, Dr. Madden spared neither time, toil, nor money. He sought for and found them in the United States of America, he sought for and dug them out of the dark recesses of Dublin Castle. These things he did, because of his truth and zeal as an Irishman; and in the pages before us we have the result of his researches, because of his truth and zeal as a Catholic. Dr. Madden has brought to his task the research that becomes an historian; and the labour in which he has been engaged has been illuminated by the information he has derived from travel, and the experience that has been imposed upon him as a politician. He writes of what he has read as occurring in the sixteenth century; and he writes of what he has seen and what he knows of countries in which monasteries have been destroyed in the nineteenth century. He has had great opportunities for ascertaining the truth—his sole desire is to publish it—and we have little doubt but the honest, the impartial, and the truth-loving portion of the public will set a proper value on his labours, and award to him that to which every good man is entitled—its approval, its applause, and its support. We intend to give a more full notice of this book in a future number.

II.—*The Philosophy of Geology*; By A. C. G. JOBERTS. London: Simpkin and Marshall, 1847.

A clever and ingenious refutation of the doctrine of “the eternity of the actual course of Nature.” It is directed chiefly against the theories of Hutton and Professor Lyell, and, though very compendious, is, in many respects, exceedingly well done.

III.—*The Sure Hope of Reconciliation.* By the Author of "Proposals for Christian Union." London: Darling, 1847.

This interesting little volume, like its predecessor, "Proposals for Christian Union," is written in a most amiable spirit: but it proceeds upon principles with which no Catholic can ever cordially sympathize, and it rests upon a hope which every experience, from Melancthon to Baron Starck, from the colloquy of Ratisbon to the conference of Hanover, has demonstrated to be idle and fallacious. It is written, however, with considerable eloquence and feeling, and displays great familiarity with the popular controversies, not only of the present, but of every succeeding age since the Reformation.

IV.—1. *The Hat:* From the German of the ABBE NELK.

2. *The Infidel Reclaimed.*

3. *The Apples.*

4. *Julian Mendoza; a Tale of the Revolution.*

5. *Marie; or the Fisherman's Daughter.*

6. *Anthony; or the Blasphemer Converted.* London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son, 1847.

To those readers who are acquainted with the earlier tales contained in Messrs. Richardson's "Catholic Juvenile Library," it is needless to say a word in commendation of these, its latest publications. They are all marked by the same ingenuous simplicity, the same unaffected piety, the same calm and not over exciting interest, which distinguished all those charming little volumes with which their cheap press has familiarized every fire-side, and which should ever be the characteristic of books intended for the use of the young. If it be lawful to particularize any of these tales, which are all so excellent, we would direct attention specially to "The Hat," by the amiable Abbé Nelk, and "Julian Mendoza, a Tale of the Revolution."

When we turn over these and numberless other juvenile books, which are now in the hands of the humblest of our young people, we cannot help wishing, with somewhat of an envious sigh, that our lines had fallen upon this, rather than on the less favoured generation in which it has been our fortune to be born.

V.—*Religion and Poetry*; Being Selections, Spiritual and Moral, from the Poetical Works of the Rev. R. Montgomery, M. A. With an Introductory Essay, by ARCHER GURNEY. London: Nisbet and Co., 1847.

Without entering here into the *vexata quæstio* of Mr. Montgomery's poetical merits, we can safely congratulate his admirers on this very handsome and tasteful collection of the spiritual and moral beauties of their favourite author. We have always held a middle opinion in this angry controversy; regarding Mr. Montgomery as possessing many of the best qualities of a great poet, but yet disfigured by mannerisms which in another would be intolerable, and too often marred, even in his best moments, by a disposition to prosiness and amplification—a disposition more perceptible and more injurious in the class of subjects which he has selected, than in those of a less grave and solemn character.

We have no hesitation, however, in saying, that he is one of those poets whose poetry reads better in extracts than in the text; and we think this selection will tend to increase his popularity.

We could have wished that the editor had confined himself to the class of extracts indicated in his title-page—"spiritual and moral" ones—and had abstained from certain offensive polemical passages, as "The Solitary Monk," (p. 194), "Romanism," (p. 252), and a few others of a similar tendency. There is not much use now-a-days in calling the Pope, antichrist.

VI.—1. *The Progress and Influence of the Catholic Church in the United States of America*. Described in a Memoir of John, Bishop of New York. By SARAH MYTTON MAURY. London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son, 1847.

2.—*Pastoral Letter of the Right Rev. Dr. Hughes, Bishop of New York, February, 1847*. New York: Edward Dunigan, 1847.

Mrs. Maury says of herself, "I am an Episcopalian, or Protestant of the Church of England, by my profession of religious faith. In this creed was I born; in this creed was I baptized, confirmed, and married; and in this creed I hope to die." Elsewhere she speaks of her long residence in America and close connection with it; she is, therefore, a competent as well as unimpeachable witness to the position held by the Catholic Church in that country.

Not that she can say much upon the subject ; she has no statistical information to give ; little more, in fact, than her participation in the prevailing opinion of the high character and increasing influence of the Church, and that, "in the increasing prevailment of the Catholic religion, lies the best safeguard for this great country of America against the evils, both public and private, which spring from the excess of liberty, (the natural result of a democracy,) and from the unavoidable and conflicting differences which may in future rend asunder the golden chain of the union." p. 15. She speaks of her own knowledge when she says: "I heard the eloquent preachers of this eloquent faith denouncing crime and encouraging virtue, and surpassing in vigour and attraction and influence the preachers of all other sects of religion." And again: "Many well judging persons, of different religious persuasions, have assured me that the only really *useful* and *corrective* education, is that of the Catholic schools and colleges. So far as I have known, these seminaries are crowded, not only with pupils of their own creed, but with those of all other sects ; and I have high official authority for saying, that the ministers and missionaries of the Roman Catholic Church, are at this moment doing more good for the cause of virtue and morality, throughout the whole continent of America, than those of any other religious denomination whatever." p. 9. There is nothing in these facts which can strike the mind of the Catholic as *new*, still less surprising ; but such a recognition of them is gratifying. The authoress' testimony to the virtues of the Bishop of New York is equally unquestionable, although her admiration occasionally leads her into such flights as that, "the Bishop is the greatest temporal prince in America, and he is the greatest spiritual prince in the world," and others of the like nature ; which prove, at least, that the venerable Bishop saw and knew nothing of her eulogium. The naive and wondering admiration with which she comments upon the little peculiarities of his dress, his manners, and general appearance, excites a smile ; but we can never feel surprised at the strong impression made upon the taste, as well as the heart, of those who first become acquainted with a dignified Catholic ecclesiastic. In the pastoral letter, the Bishop of New York speaks for himself in an earnest and plain address, recapitulating the great things done by him in

his diocese, stirring up the people to co-operate with him, cheering their hearts and exciting their charity by a view of the great progress now making by our holy religion.

VII.—*Church Melodies*; By Viscount MASSEREENE and FERRARET, London: Alyott and Jones, 1847.

We are told in the commencement of this work that the proceeds of its sale are intended for the relief of the distressed Irish, and certainly it is a fitting and noble means for the attainment of the charitable object. In these *Church Melodies* there is a spirit of devotion, tender, solemn, or triumphant, but ever fervent, which will speak strongly to many a heart, and needs no recommendation.

There are few Christians who would not in some degree feel this, although to Catholics the attraction is diminished or rendered painful, by the false theology frequently introduced, and still more often perceptible in the hard and narrow views which Calvinism never fails to produce. It would, however, be uncharitable in us to dwell upon this, the misfortune more than the fault of the noble author; we would rather commend the nature in which it has generated so little bitterness, and turn from this part of our subject. These melodies are most of them adapted to the Sundays and principal festivals of the Church of England throughout the year; and were undoubtedly intended to be sung in congregations, schools, or families, according to the text prefixed as a motto to the collection, "Singing and making melody in your hearts to the Lord." For this purpose they are most happily adapted; the rhythm is various and elegant—and so remarkably musical and flowing, that it falls naturally into the cantabile; in some instances the airs the rhythm would seem to require might be of too light a character for Church service, but this need be no objection in the devotions of a family. For the alphabetical hymns at the conclusion, the author pleads as a sort of excuse "the deep meaning contained in the Holy and Ancient Language of Symbols, whose every letter has a signification and a power unknown in our less living modern tongues." With this feeling we cannot sympathize; the Alphabet to us is hopelessly vulgarised, and the adapting verses to it in different arrangements is a 'tour de force' we do not greatly admire; but we can truly say that in this instance it is admirably executed.

VIII.—*The Lives of the Fathers of the Desert, and of many Holy Men and Women who Dwelt in Solitude.* Translated from the French. London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son, 1847.

It would be impossible to recommend this little volume too highly, though its title may perhaps convey a false idea of its contents. It is not so much a collection of the *Lives* of the saints of the desert, as of anecdotes and passages from their lives. And in this respect it is far preferable to the larger and popular book under the same title, which contains a good deal of matter that may well be regarded as a drawback on its usefulness.

The lives (if such we are to call them) in this volume are exceedingly brief; but they are pithy, significant, and striking; and, generally speaking, convey in a few short and simple sentences an amount of instruction which it would be easy to extend into so many pages.

IX.—*The Life and Adventures of Robinson Crusoe*; Written by Himself. A New Edition, with Illustrations. London: Burns, 1847.

We are rejoiced to see this delightful edition of our old favourite, Robinson Crusoe, which has now received a few improvements, so simple and obvious, and so greatly required, that we are surprised that they should not have been made sooner. In the first part of the story the alterations appear to have been limited to a judicious but slight revision. In the second, the story has been skilfully condensed, and rendered more readable than hitherto it has been generally considered; this is an improvement entirely distinct from the process of *abridgment*, under which books generally suffer much—and probably no one ever read the second part of Robinson Crusoe without feeling that it was wanted. The work forms a handsome volume, and is got up and illustrated in the elegant well-finished style so well known as belonging to Mr. Burns, the gentleman upon whom it has pleased Heaven lately to confer an especial grace, rejoicing the hearts of Catholics by his conversion, and enriching them by the remarkable taste and enterprise which he has begun already to devote to their cause.

X.—*Instructions for Children*, By the Rev. JOHN GOTHER. With authority. London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson & Son, 1847.

Very useful and solid instruction, given in a catechetical form, and a simple and somewhat quaint style.

- XI.—*The Life and Writings of the Rev. Dr. Chalmers*, By the Rev. HENRY DAVIS, M. A. London: Gilbert, 1847.

This little work can scarcely be called 'the Life' of the late Dr. Chalmers, for nothing can be slighter than the biographical sketch which it contains; it is rather a tribute of intense admiration, a highly coloured eulogium.

What is most interesting to the general reader, is the account of the part Dr. Chalmers took in the great schism of the Scottish Church, and the high-church principles upon which he acted, and which were indeed strained to the utmost in this violent dismemberment of the Church which they are pleased to call 'Rock founded;' 'having Christ for its head;' the 'nursing-mother of the people,' &c.; but in all this, and indeed throughout his life, we cannot doubt that Dr. Chalmers acted the part of a good, sincere, and strong-minded man, carrying out his convictions with an energy and ability which well entitle him to the gratitude of his adherents, and to the sympathy of those who estimate at their full value the well-meaning and well-doing, under whatever spiritual disadvantage they may recognize them. Dr. Chalmers's theology was—it could not be otherwise—full of error; yet often—and chiefly in his astronomical sermons—he had clear views of truth, and developed them with grandeur of thought and eloquence of language: and the many extracts from his writings which complete this tribute to his memory, will not only gratify his admirers, but will interest those who would not trouble themselves to read the works of one who, however highly gifted, was still but as "the blind leader of the blind."

- XII.—1. *The Lives of St. Thomas of Villanova, Archbishop of Valencia, and Augustinian Friar, and of St. Francis Solano, Apostle of Peru, of the Order of St. Francis.* Permissu Superiorum.
2. *The Lives of St. Rose of Lima, the Blessed Colomba of Rieti, and of St. Juliana Falconieri.* Permissu Superiorum. London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son, 1847.

The conclusion of the life of St. Philip Neri has been postponed until this December, on what account we know not; certainly not from a lack of diligence or determination in the editors of this noble series of Catholic Biography; for in an incredibly short space of time two other volumes have been given to the public, comprising the

lives of five great saints—and these have not been got up in a hurried or sketchy manner. We have an account of the learned authorities from which they have been compiled; the style is elegant and pure, and the details of the lives are given with plainness, fidelity, and a sort of loving sweetness which is full of charm. It is indeed no easy task for human beings who, however holy, are not yet raised to such a glorious height as they describe, to take in hand these chosen vessels of the Lord; to relate, to comment upon, to analyze those lives which were raised to an eminence, that being placed so high above humanity, they might allure that feeble but aspiring nature upwards. To make the natural man admire or even tolerate those wonderful austerities which show nature wholly subdued, nay crucified—to make the man whose duties, pleasures, objects, are all of this world, whose prayers are a wearisome duty, and who has in consequence seldom received in them even that sweetness which our heavenly Father vouchsafes for the encouragement of his least worthy children—to make such a man rejoice in the unutterable condescension with which God honours those who honour him, would be no less a superhuman act than to give him of that grace which filled these favoured souls. And if this is difficult with ordinary persons—with Catholics—what miracle of prudence shall obtain the toleration of the misbelieving and the bad? The editor has wisely judged this to be too impossible to be attempted; and in an admirable preface has justified the boldness with which he has made known the wonders of God, even in those cases where Catholics themselves may feel “a little startled.”

“The visible intermingling of the natural and supernatural worlds, seems to increase, as the saints approach through the grace of God to their first innocence, may even offend where persons have been in the habit of paring and bating down the unearthly, in order to evade objections, and lighten the load of the controversialist, rather than of meditating with awe and thankfulness, and deep self-abasement on the wonders of God in His saints, or of really sounding the depths of Christian philosophy, and mastering the principles and general laws which are discernible even in the supernatural regions of hagiology. The habit of always thinking first how any tenet, or practice, or fact, is most conveniently presentable to an adversary, may soon, and almost imperceptibly lead to profaneness, by introducing the spirit of rationalism into matters of faith; and, to judge from the works of our greatest Catholic divines, it would appear that the deeper

theologian a man is, the less does he give way to this studious desire of making difficulties easy at any cost short of denying what is positively de fide. They seem to handle truth religiously, just in the way that God is pleased to give it us, rather than to see what they can make of it themselves by shaping it for controversy, and so by dint of skilful manipulation, squeeze it through a difficulty. The question is not, What will men say of this? How will this sound in controversy? Will not this be objected to by heretics? But, is this true? Is this kind of thing approved by the Church? Then what good can I get out of it for my own soul? Ought not my views to be deeper than they are?"—p. 7.

In this passage Mr. Faber has struck at the root of a great error, and in the following he perhaps explains why many a good and sincere Catholic has been disappointed in his reasonable hope of winning the souls he loved to the true religion; his faith was too weak "to remove mountains."

"Persons, who have unfortunately more call to defend their religion than time to study it, fancy they gain a sort of mock strength, or at least pleasantly and triumphantly surprise an adversary, when they throw over-board, to his mercy, as sailors throw meat to a shark, any thing wonderful, as though it were necessarily superstitious. But in this way a man may make wild work of solemn things without knowing it, and he whets rather than stays the appetite of his opponent, who presently follows him up again with a new, and, indeed, in his case, an unanswerable charge of inconsistency. A Catholic, do what he will, cannot weed his religion of the supernatural; and to discriminate between the supernatural and the superstitious, is a long work and a hard one, a work of study and of reverent meditation. Oh how hard it is, if men do not kneel to meditate, to hear a thing denied all round them every day, and yet maintain a joyous and unshaken faith therein."—p. 7.

Mr. Faber proceeds to urge still more strongly upon Catholics the necessity of frankly accepting those miracles, the *possibility* of which he cannot as *matter of Faith* deny, and for the certainty of which as *matters of fact* there is such strong evidence.

"And when the series gets on, and the reader finds men and women of different centuries and vastly different characters, of the hills of Apulia and Calabria, from the plains of Lombardy and the stony forests of Umbria; from Spanish convents and French seminaries; from the dark streets of a Flemish town, the margin of a Dutch canal, to the ilex woods of Portugal; from the cities of Ger-

many and Hungary or the mines and river sides of South America ; popes and simple nuns, bishops and common beggars, the learned cardinal and the capuchin lay-brother, the aged missionary and the boy in the Jesuit noviciate, the Roman princess and the poor bedridden Estatica, before the Reformation and after it—all presenting us with the same picture, the same supernatural actors, the same familiarity with good and evil spirits, the same daily colloquial intercourse with the unseen world, the same apparently grotesque anecdotes of miraculous control over nature, and the lives narrating all this translated from four or five different languages, and composed by grave theologians and doctors, the erudite Augustinian, the judicious Dominican, the good Franciscan full of simplicity and unction, the fluent Oratorian, so eminent in devotional biography, the sound, calm, and discriminating Jesuit, who, above all others, has learned how to exercise the constant caution of criticism without injuring his spiritual mindedness—when all this is before him, crowned with the solemn and infallible decrees of canonization and beatification, it may seem to him then a serious question whether he himself is not out of harmony with the mind of the church, whether his faith is not too feeble, and his distrust of God's wonders too overweening and too bold, whether, in short, for the good of his own soul, he may not have the principle of rationalism to unlearn, and the temper of faith, sound, reasonable, masculine, yet childlike faith, to broaden, to heighten, and to deepen in himself by the very contemplation of what may now be in some degree a scandal to him—namely, *quam mirabilis est Deus in sanctis suis.*”—p. 10.

The line of argument adopted by Mr. Faber renders his preface peculiarly appropriate to this volume ; for it contains the lives of three great saints to whom the favour of Heaven was manifested in a peculiarly marvellous and mystical manner ; theirs was not the general case, where the growth of grace in the soul corresponds in a natural manner, although in a supernatural *degree*, with that of the human reason ; but in these wonderful saints, at that age when the soul with all its powers is folded like the colourless embryo of a flower within its green and tender envelope, when the senses distinguish imperfectly—and the little helpless being at the mercy of others, asserts its individuality only by the exercise of a most imperfect instinct ; even at this age it pleased the Almighty that they should discern and embrace His Will, recognise His Spirit in the souls of men, and do homage to it aloud ; nay, that they should take up their cross and perform acts of penance and of submission to suffering truly wonderful ; and to this dawn succeeded a day of corresponding glory. What

shall we say to miracles so lovely yet so awful! to these angels sent to dwell amongst us, no longer spiritual strangers walking the earth unseen—but of our own nature, children of that second Adam by whom that nature was regenerated! The words of St. Paul occur forcibly to our minds, “Whom He foreknew, them He also predestinated;” (Rom. viii. 29.) but let us abstain from enquiring further into this mystery of love, seeking rather to rejoice in it with veneration: and why indeed should there be any difficulty in this to Catholics? Let us consider the spiritual part, the souls only of the saints; when we can do this, do their contempt of the world, their love of God—of communing with Him—and of His creatures for His sake, or the close union permitted to them by Him, surprise us? By no means; we know that this is the natural condition of the angels, than whom Christians are but “a little lower;” we know that it must inevitably be, in a greater or less degree, the future condition of every soul that is saved—and, as we hope, even of our own, most unworthy; nor considering the vast disparity amongst the creatures of God, can we feel it hard to admit that some may be privileged to anticipate that blessed condition to which even we ourselves aspire ultimately. It is the *Body*—that most incongruous, earth-sprung and heaven-aspiring, most vile yet indeed magnificent creature, which darkens our perception of this truth, which occasions all the disparity—all that is startling, painful, sometimes—let us say it fearfully but reverently—absurd, or disgusting to nature, in the lives of the Saints. Yet that this instrument should be made, even in its weakness, a means to the glory of God, and that in order to this, it must be purified and rendered so entirely subservient to the holy longings and purposes of its spiritual tenant, that at length it must cease to be an obstacle in the way of the Divine favours to that soul—is a truth that requires not Faith for its reception, so easily does it follow upon a sound and even a natural reasoning—supposing the admission is once made of the spiritual nature of man and his communion with the Divinity, and with other spiritual natures. We have been led into a subject, strictly speaking, beyond the province of these pages; but it is difficult to read such works as these, and not feel the mind attracted to elevated subjects. Should this effect be produced widely and permanently amongst

the Catholics of this country, the pious labours of the holy confraternity of St. Wilfrid will have found even in this world their reward.

XIII.—*Histoire de Henri VIII., et du Schisme de l'Angleterre.* Par M. Audin. 2 vols., 8vo. Paris, 1847.

We have barely space to announce the appearance of this important work, and to promise that we shall take an early opportunity of returning to it.

XIV.—1. *The Dumb Child, and The Robber's Castle.*

2. *The Statue of Saint George.*

3. *The Rose-Bush.*

4. *Godfrey, the Little Hermit*; from the German of CANON SCHMID.

5. *Fidelity Rewarded*, from the German of ABBÉ NELK.

6. *Catholic Tales*, By a Lady. London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son, 1847.

This seems the commencement of a series of little stories, cheaply got up and well selected, and which will doubtless be productive of much good. They come within the compass of any little boy or girl's pocket money; they may be given with satisfaction by any parent; and—which we can answer for it, is not always the case—that satisfaction will be mutual; for the stories contain enough of incident to captivate the attention of the most determined of the little embryo novel-readers whom—in spite of all that can be said or lectured to the contrary—we are training up in our nurseries. We do not ourselves object to this; the tendency to solace the real troubles of life by the exercise of imagination and sympathy is too early, and strongly, and universally developed, not to have been given for some good purpose, or at least to be capable of being turned to one, as in the present instance. In the merit of these stories there is considerable inequality—the Abbé Nelk's 'Fidelity Rewarded' is meagre, and his somewhat pompous and inflated style, shows him ill at ease in the task he has undertaken. The "Catholic Tales" are both flimsy and flowery; but Canon Schmid excels as a story-teller: his store of incidents is really surprising—they are told in a straightforward manner, and with all the earnest circumstantial fulness of detail in which children so much delight.

XV.—*Hawbuck Grange; or the Sporting Adventures of Thomas Scott, Esq.* By the Author of *Handley Cross; or the Spa Hunt, &c.* With eight Illustrations by Phiz. London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans, 1847.

This work is probably well known already to all sporting readers, having made its first appearance in the columns of *Bell's Life in London*; and having there acquired great popularity, the numbers have now been collected into an octavo volume, very well got up, and embellished by some of Phiz's clever and spirited caricatures. The sportsman will thus gladly welcome an old friend—a delightful substitute for the 'Annual Register,' so gravely recommended by 'Mister Tom Scott' as the proper reading for a frosty (or blank) day. But it is our opinion that others besides sportsmen will find amusement in this volume.

It is not easy indeed to say why those who, like ourselves, (we blush to own it) scarcely know a hound from a terrier, should take pleasure in reading of all the intricacies of the chase. Nevertheless this author brings the whole picture so vividly before the mind's eye, with such grotesqueness of form, such freshness of colouring, such vivid enjoyment, such original and racy observations—in a word, *truth* and *life* are so excellently rendered, that probably those only who could see the actual scenes without enjoyment—and they are few in number—will take up the book without pleasure.

XVI.—*The Catholic Music-Book*; containing appropriate and easy Pieces for most of the Services of the Church. Part V. London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son, 1847.

We can but register the progress of this cheap and admirable collection. The present Part brings us to page 120, and contains two Litanies of our Blessed Lady, the "Laudate Dominum," and a "Hymn to St. Joseph." The typographical execution is exceedingly tasteful, and, what is far more important, appears to be scrupulously accurate.

We have barely space to announce the appearance of several important works,—amongst which are three very excellent volumes: *The Life of St. Aloysius of Gonzaga*, by Her Serene Highness Maria Elisa, Princess di Gonzaga, &c.—*The Catholic Christian's Complete Manual*, by Ambrose Lisle Phillipps, Esq., of Grace Dieu Manor—and the *Introduction to a Devout Life*, by the Rev. James Jones. We promise notices of these in our next number.

INDEX TO VOLUME TWENTY-THREE.

- Allegorical principle*, admitted in the Church, 34.
- Almagro*, his death, 333.
- America South*, central States of, 78—revolutions of 1824, 79—their present rulers, Carrera and Gardiola, 80—their internal resources, 82—mode of living there, 85—their debt, 85—colleges, 86.
- Amphilochius St.*, his opinion of the sacred books of Scripture, 117.
- Amy Herbert*, 182.
- Analogy*, Butler's, in what cases his reasoning cannot properly be applied, 500.
- Anathemas*, lawful to the Church, 40—reconcilable with Christian forgiveness, 51.
- Anglican* to remain where he is his safe way, 502—first reason given by Mr. Keble, 504—fallacy of, 505.
- Anglicans*, attempt communion with the Eastern Christians, and are repulsed, 407—still claim consideration on account of them, 408—enulogise them, 408—consider the worship of the Virgin the only barrier between themselves and them, 409.
- Anscharius St.*, Apostle of the North, 305.
- Antiquities Catholic*, in Scandinavia, 307, 309—Runic inscriptions, 311—Maltese cross, 311—Catholic tendencies of inscriptions, 313.
- Antiquities*, Irish, by Mr. Reeve, 471—arrangement of the work, 476—his description of a Round Tower, 481.
- Arnold Dr.*, his religious opinions, 134.
- Atahualpa*, his capture, 329—his death, 334.
- Athanasius St.*, his catalogue of sacred books, 115.
- Authorresses*, 179.
- Avallaneda*, his *Don Quixote*, 294.
- Ballykilby*, 495.
- Bible* the, proper use of, 105—canonical books according to the Anglicans, 107.
- Bible*, no good to be done by an indiscriminate dissemination of, 145—exposes it to unworthy treatment, 148—reading the Bible the fruit rather than the result of a religious education, 149—giving them does not ensure their being read, 150—fruits produced from Bible reading in national schools, 151—examples of misapprehension, 152—reasons why the distribution of the Scriptures cannot be the means ordained by God, 155—the Bible is a means not accessible, 156—does not produce concordant conclusions, 157—contrary to analogy that instruction should be so conveyed, 157—or medicine for our moral maladies, 167—would argue a total change in the plans of God, 168—does not bear the stamp of success, 168—waste of energy occasioned by the bible societies, 169—what use the Catholic Church makes of the Bible, 174.
- Biography*, 204.
- Bishops*, Russian, assisted to bind slavery upon the people, and to make them subservient to it, 450.
- Book of Rights*, 486.
- Books*, notices of 257, 522.
- Bore*, M. Eugene, 440.
- Boswell*, first of biographers, 203.
- Brougham, Lord*, his edition of Johnson's works, 203—mistakes, 207, 208, 215—his opinion of Buchanan, 225.
- Bronson, Mr.*, his *Quarterly Review*, 373—controversy with him, 376, 377, 380, 382, 387, 400, 402.
- Bunsen*, Chevalier, his work, 133—principles on which he bases his Church of the future, 134—admits a ministry, 131—contradictory notions, 136—method of reconciling them, 138—his false views of history, 143—opinions of the Anglican clergy, 143—charge against Catholics, 144.
- Byzantium*, Prelate of, his titles, 453.
- Canon of Scripture*, 109—decisions of councils respecting, 112—arguments in favour of the Catholic canon, 113—from the apostolical constitutions, 114—and canons, 114—the Fathers, 114.
- Canus*, his opinions of development, 401.
- Carrera*, Rafael, 80.
- Catalogue*, Harleian, 209.
- Catalogue* of curious relics at Copenhagen, 320.
- Catherine II.*, her opinion of Russian learning, 467.
- Catherine of Iroquois*, her life, 93.
- Catholic*, his moral grounds for holding to his religion, 514—wanting to an Anglican, 514—love of holiness, 514.
- Catholics* far more numerous than schismatics in the East, 432—under the same disadvantages have not fallen into the same degradation, 441—higher condition of their women, 445.
- Chinese*, their adoption of English customs, 71—their dispositions for religion, 72.
- Christians*, Eastern, scattered communities not to be called a Church, 430—their small and

- decaying numbers, 431—their degraded condition, 433—constant desertions to Rome, 435—immorality, 441.
- Christianity*, when introduced into Ireland and Norway, 305, 306—when into Russia, 421.
- Christopher*, Cornet, prisoner amongst the Turks, 7.
- Church*, Anglican, its isolation after the Reformation, 406—claims to have descended from a purer period, 407.
- Church*, Anglican, movement existing in her, 518.
- Church Catholic*, censorship over the Spanish novelists, 276—possesses the power of raising propositions into matters of faith, 375—authorities for this, 379.
- Church*, Catholic, all history bearing testimony to her truth, 468.
- Church*, Catholic, whether always explicitly holding the contrary of heresy, 391—testimonies borne to her supremacy by the Greek Church, 412—by Photius, author of the schism, 417—by the Council of Florence, 421—has the power of expelling heresies to which schismatical churches succumb, 433—progress making by her in the East, 446.
- Church*, Greek, anathematizes the doctrines of the Reformation, 409—doctrines professed by it in 1723, 410—is a witness for the Catholic Church, 412—acknowledged her supremacy, 412—instances of this admission, 413—the same testimony is borne by the Russian Church now, 416—by Photius, author of the schism, 417—by Michael Palæologus, 419—succumbs to the heresies of the conquerors, 434.
- Church Greek*, does not exist out of Greece, 454.
- Church* of St. Patrick in Down, 466.
- Church* of the Future, M. Bunsen's, 134.
- Church*, Russian, in communion with Rome in 988, 424—its gradual subjection, 425—placed under a directing Synod, which still rules it, 430—is a political instrument 447—unity unknown in it, 419—compared with that of England, 449—an object of horror to the serfs, 450—does not possess Catholicity, 453—does not maintain her own religion, 455—her fear of the Catholic Church, 456—wanting in fecundity, 456—no claim to the test of holiness, 459—infrequency of communion, 461—her state of temporal and spiritual slavery, 462—all ecclesiastical authority vested in the Synod, 463.
- Church Russian*, its want of learning, 465—pretence to having it, 466—other impositions, 467.
- Church*, the true, tests of, 449.
- Churches* in Scandinavia, 308.
- Clergy*, Christian, difficult for protestants to define their powers, 137—Catholics should qualify themselves to obtain confidence, 171.
- Clergy*, taxes upon them, 473.
- Conflict* between the civil and ecclesiastical power in England, 520.
- Controversy*, high-church, its commencement, 497—and end, 498.
- Cosin*, Bishop, his history of the canon of Scripture, 106.
- Council of Florence*, 420.
- Cross*, Maltese, found in Scandinavian monuments, 311—theory concerning them, 312.
- Cross*, stone, deaths of those who pulled it down, 483.
- Cyril*, St., his catalogue of sacred books, 117.
- Cyril*, Lucar, anathema against him, 409.
- David*, king of Israel, 27—how far he should be considered in the Psalms as the type of Christ, 31—his character as a moral governor, 36—whether he had any gift of discernment into men's hearts, 38—faith necessary to enter into his feelings, 43—his forbearance, 51.
- Development*, doctrine of, 376—admitted by all Catholic writers in greater or less degree, 377—instances, 378—Suarez concerning, 386—canons concerning, 401.
- Diego*, de Mendoza, 293.
- Dionysius* the Areopagite, admits the books of the Apocalypse and Wisdom, 114.
- Doutreleau*, Father, his escape, 103.
- Downpatrick*, burial-place of Saints, 478—taken possession of by John de Courcy, 479—by Edward Bruce, 480—restoration of the old abbey church begun, 481.
- Dunlop*, Mr., adventures in America, 87.
- Eggs*, establishment for hatching them at Chusan, 61.
- Energy* in religious matters inculcated by our Lord, 502.
- English*, the, a business-like people, even in religion, 146.
- Epiphanius*, St., which of the sacred books he admits into the canon, 117.
- Faber*, the Rev. Mr., 124.
- Faith*, Koble's theory concerning, 501.
- Faith*, 41—must be in living persons, 165.
- Faith*, nature of, 156.
- Fathers*, the, of the Church, discrepancies of opinion respecting the books of Scripture, 114.
- Fish*, mode of catching them in China, 63.
- Fisher*, his opinion of Purgatory, 381.
- Flanagan*, Rev. Thos.: 366—manner of dealing with Irish affairs, 369—with antiquarian history, 371.
- Fort George*, massacre of the English on its surrender, 90.
- Fortune*, Mr., his botanical researches in China, 60—his adventure, 60—researches for flowers, 64—visits Zeintung, 67—another adventure, 70—encounters pirates, 74.
- Fullerton*, Lady Georgiana, her works, 179, 184—her conversion, 184.
- Funeral*, Indian, 98.
- Gagge*, James, Reformer of Denmark, 313.
- Grantley Manor*, 186—extract from, 187.
- Greece*, in imitation of Russia, has withdrawn from the jurisdiction of Constantinople, 463.
- Greeks*, desolation that fell upon them, 419, 422—their present wretched condition, 423.
- Gregory Nazianzen*, St., 117.
- Hacon* the Good, 305.
- Hampden*, Dr., censured by the University of Oxford, 519—Anglican bishops oppose his nomination to a bishopric, 520.
- Handbooks*, German, 364—English substitutes, 364.
- Handschuch*, Professor, his commentary on the Psalms, 36—extracts from, 43, 64.
- Heon*, Mr., his contest with the Dublin University, 229—his researches, 322.
- History*, Irish, impulse lately given to the study of it, 470.
- History*, Irish, materials for, 469—greatly wanted, 491—especially the labours of Irish ecclesiastics, 492—also of the Catholic Church since the Reformation, 494.
- Hungary* conquered by the Turks, 4.
- Hungarians*, their dissatisfaction, 17.
- Hutchinson*, Provost, 333.

Imitation of Christ, 223.
Immaculate Conception, opinions of Petavius, 385—of Vasquez, 388—of St. Alphonsus, 389.
Inscriptions in Scandinavia, 313—revengeful, 316—in Switzerland, 317—date of Runic inscriptions, 317—upon fonts, crosses, &c., 319.
Iroquois, Saint, 95.
Jebb, Bishop, his opinion of universal reading of the Scriptures, 158.
Jeremy II., Patriarch of Constantinople, sells the rights of his Patriarchate, 429—had acknowledged the supremacy of the Pope, 429.
Jerome, St., his opinion of the Books of Scripture, 120.
Jesuits, 90.
Job, first Patriarch of Russia, 429.
John, last Catholic Pastor and martyr in Denmark, 313.
Johnson, Dr., 205—his life, 206—blunder in an anecdote concerning him, 207—first literary essays, 207—other works, 208—his letter to Lord Chesterfield, 213—domestic afflictions, 213—unnoticed in fashionable life, 213—obtains a pension and an interview with George III., 214—rapidity of writing, 214—stay in Scotland, 216—goes to France, 217—his notes on Shakespere, 218—language concerning the Americans, 221—the Irish and West Indies, 222—his Lives of the poets, 227.
Kara, Mustapha, vizier commanding the Turkish force at the second siege of Vienna, 17—description of his conquered camp, 24—his death, 26.
Kebble, Mr., his preface, 498—proposes perfect immobility, 499—improper use of arguments drawn from Butler's Analogy, 500—his views upon Faith, 501—his quietism opposed to the spirit of Scripture, 502—considerations by which he proposes that an Anglican should quiet his conscience, 504—five motives for remaining in the Anglican Church, 505—first objection against them—novelty, 509—applicable only to one 'branch,' 509—no manifestation 'ad extra,' 510—no proof from Scripture, &c., Anglican articles, &c., 511—supports himself by an appeal to private judgment, 512—Mr. Keble's special pleading, 513—all his motives tell in favour of the Catholic Church, 514—and of remaining in it, 516.
Kip, Rev. Abraham, his translation of the letters from the early Jesuit missionaries, 90.
Kolschitzki, George Francis, his gallantry and intelligence, 19.
Laneton Parsonage, 183.
Langton, Dr., 489.
Laroque, L'Abbe, 207.
Latin, blunders in, 225.
Leahar nag-Ceara, 485.
Literature, light Catholic, wanted in England, 279.
Literature of Ireland, 305.
Lope de Vega, 215—his Pastores de Belen, 280.
Mahomet II., his projects. I—career of his successors, 2.
Maistre, De, on the Gallican writers, 384.
Malou, M., 145—extract from his work, 175.
Manual of British and Irish History, 365—extract from, 367.
Melito, Bishop, 115.
Melville, Mr., his adventures in the Marquesas, 343—vessel and crew he sails with, 345—bad provisions in his ship, 347—arrives at Tahiti, 348—mutiny, 349—he and his companion

leave their ship, 350—engage as labourers in the Island of Imeco, 351—set to work, 352—a pagan dance, 354—arrive at Partoowy. 356—missionary, 356—visit the Queen, 356.
Mirabeau, 209.
Missionaries, Protestant and Catholic, 73—scene in the life of one, 92—at Tahiti, 356.
Moliere, 215, 219.
Muret, M. A., anecdote concerning, 225.
Napoleon, passage of his remains through France, 218.
Natches, massacre of the tribe of, 101.
Newman, Mr., his definition of the powers of the Church, 137.
Nicholas, Emperor of Russia, his testimony to the state of that Empire, 449—opposes himself to the conversion of his heathen sub acts, 458—has abolished immovable impediments to marriage without opposition from the clergy, 463.
Novelists, Spanish, little hitherto known, 274—compared with the German, 275—are under the influence of religion, 275—extract from one, 278—compared with French novelists, 283—their Catholicity, 284—extract, 285—their humour, 286—description of hell, 290—extracts, 292, 298.
Ochoa, Don Eugenio de, 302.
Offices of Priests, proper time for reciting, 28.
Onaco, 343.
Oratorians, Institution of, 128—methods pursued by them in conference, 129.
Origen, sacred books which he receives, 115.
Pedro, de Gasca, 339.
Peru, its condition when discovered, 327.
Petavius on the Immaculate Conception, 385.
Peter the Great, his speech when abolishing the Patriarchate, 462.
Philaster of Brescia, his opinion of canonical books, 118.
Philip Neri, St., 125—his life, 126—diversions invented by him for the people, 130.
Pizarro, Francis, his birth, 324—sails for Panama, 325—discovers Peru, 325—follows up his discovery, 326—his reception, 327—his march to Caxamalea, 328—capture of Atahualpa, 329—treatment of him, 334—receives an embassy from prince Manco, 335—founds the city of Lima, 335—civil wars with Almagro, 335—his death, 336.
Poetry, whether called forth more or less in the Catholic or Anglican Churches, 253.
Pomare, Queen, 357.
Prescott, Mr. W. H., 322.
Priests of the Russian Church, their immorality, 460—drunkenness, 460—utter contempt into which they have fallen, 464.
Priests, Irish, difficulties in the way of their restoring Irish literature, 490—illustrious throughout Europe, 494.
Pritchard, Mrs., anecdote of, 348.
Psalms, commentators upon, 27—imprecations contained in them, 37—how far they may be used by the Church, 40—symbolical of divine things, 53—their applicability to private devotion, 56.
Puffing, system of, 341.
Quevedo, 290.
Raskolnism, extent to which it prevails in the Church of Russia, 449.
Raskolnik, reasons why he no longer fears persecution, 450—same reasons apply to other

- sects, 451—were persecuted until their secessions from the empire, 451—their numbers, 451.
- Rasles, Father, 92—his escape, 94—his death, 95.
- Rever, Mr., 463, 494.
- Revelation, nature of that which God has made to man, 162.
- Rhodes, its conquest, 2.
- Rosary of the Blessed Virgin, 251—from whence compiled, 255—extract, 255.
- Ross, Miss Thomsina, her translation of the history of Spanish literature, 273.
- Runic writing, 510, 517.
- Saint Patrick, his hand, 494.
- Saints, three patrons of Ireland, grave made for them by the people, 482.
- Scandinavia, the reformation there, 306—present state of religion there, 307—churches, 308—inscriptions, 313—fonts, crosses, &c., 319—singular cruets, 320.
- Schism of the Greeks, 417.
- Scotia, ancient name of Ireland, 492.
- Scott, Mariana, 452.
- Scots, their multiplicity in Russia, 452.
- Septuagint, scriptures which it contained, 110—quoted by the Fathers, 111.
- Shakespeare, 319.
- Shrine of St. Patrick's hand, 483.
- Sobieski, John, king of Poland, 18.
- Societies for publishing ancient Irish documents, 470.
- Society, Archæological, 488.
- Soliman, Sultan, his conduct on raising the siege of Vienna, 12—sets at liberty Cornet Zedlitz, 14—attacks the fortress of Szigeth, 15—his death, 15.
- Stakreberg, Count, entrusted with the defence of Vienna, 19.
- Suarez concerning Church authority, 386—upon definitions of doctrine, 400—his explanation of St. Thomas Aquinas' sense, 404.
- Sylvius, 403.
- Synod held at Constantinople, 409.
- Synod in Russia, presided over by the emperor and his military officers, 463.
- Takhtians, present condition of, 359—their Church service, 361—their rapid decrease, 363.
- Ten, 71.
- Teintung, town of, 67.
- Tekeli, Count, 17—forces under his command, 17.
- Tombs, violation of, 482.
- Traditions connected with places, 495.
- Turks, feelings entertained for them by Christians, 3—their position in respect to Europe, 3—ravages of their army in Germany, 5—cities taken by them, 6—besiege Vienna, 6—renewal of the war in alliance with Count Tekeli, 17—their total rout at the second siege of Vienna, 23.
- Turks, their different estimation of the Catholics and schismatics, 437, 441.
- University of Louvain, 145, 177.
- University of Dublin, impediments to Catholics therein, 229— anecdotes of the students formerly, 232—election of Hutchinson, 233—its revenues, 234—comfortable situation of Fellows, 235—inefficient teaching they give, 236—examination of students, 237—society and mode of living there, 239—historical society, 240—list of its members, 241—revived society, 241—small number of Catholics who have entered, 242—their disadvantageous position there, 243—perversions for the sake of degrees, 244, 249—college anti-catholic in spirit and teaching, 245.
- Universities, English history of them translated from German, 228.
- Vasco, Nunez de Balboa, 323—claims the Pacific and all that it contains, 324.
- Vienna, sieges of, 2—preparations for its defence, 6, 11— anecdotes of the siege, 10—second siege, 17— anecdotes of, 19—raising of the siege, 21.
- Virgin, Blessed, exempt from venial sin, 379.
- Wills of St. Patrick, 495.
- Whiteside, Mr., 231.
- Zapolya, John, Count of Zips, 4—does homage for the crown of Hungary to Soliman, 5.
- Zedlitz, Cornet, anecdote of, 14.
- Zondras does not give the title of Saint to any Patriarch of Constantinople after Ignatius, 459.
- Zring, Count, his defence of the fortress Szigeth, 15.

